THE SCHOOL REVIEW

A JOURNAL OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

VOLUME XXXVI JUNE 1928 NUMBER 6

Educational News and Editorial Comment

PUPILS ENROLLED IN HIGH SCHOOLS AND GRADUATES OF HIGH SCHOOLS

Two quotations from statements recently published by the Bureau of Education present the most recent statistics on high-school attendance and graduation from high school. The first is as follows:

In review, it may be stated that the public high school has had a wonderful growth. Although only a century old, its enrolment has reached approximately 4,000,000 pupils. Estimating the number of persons in the United States of high-school age (those of ages 15, 16, 17, and 18) as 7,779,070 for 1926, these schools have enrolled 48.2 per cent of those who might be expected to attend high schools. Private high schools and preparatory departments of higher institutions enrol another 4.8 per cent, so that 53 per cent of all pupils of high-school age are now enrolled in secondary schools. The public high school will continue to grow but probably at a rate more nearly that of the growth of population.

The second quotation is as follows:

The number of graduates from high schools during the school year 1925–26 shows increases over the 1920 figures of 110 per cent for boys and 74.2 per cent for girls. While more girls than boys graduate from high school, more boys than girls attend college. The percentages of the 1925 graduates who attended some college during 1926 are 37.4 for boys and 27.8 for girls.

For 1925, 12,445 public high schools reported 396,003 graduates, of which number 126,782 went to college in 1926, and 54,246 others attended some other institution.

SCIENTIFIC DETERMINATION OF STANDARDS

An article prepared by E. D. Grizzell, chairman of the Commission on Secondary Schools of the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Middle States and Maryland, appears in the April number of *School Life*. Professor Grizzell compares the standards for secondary schools now accepted by the four regional associations which prepare lists of approved schools. The article describes the points of agreement and disagreement in the present standards and concludes with the following significant paragraph.

> There is great need for research to determine the validity of certain existing standards. For example, the standards for teaching load are being questioned in some quarters. A matter of such importance should not be dismissed with a mere gesture. Standards for laboratory and library should be defined more clearly. There should be adequate standards for school records, pupil load, salaries, expenditures for secondary education, student activities, and a score of other significant features and relationships. The necessity for careful research is apparent if standardization in secondary education is to serve as a means of promoting sound progress.

The conclusion reached by the representative of the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Middle States and Maryland is the same as that which was repeatedly emphasized at the meeting of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools in March.

On April 26, at a hearing before the Education Committee of the House of Representatives, attention was called by representatives of the various standardizing associations to the necessity of studies on a national scale in order to meet the demands for a scientific determination of the practices which should be adopted in secondary schools and in colleges. Congress was asked to support such studies.

All these indications are promising evidences that an era of scientific study of secondary and higher education is at hand. It is to be hoped that resources will be supplied to aid in the solution of the problems confronting American education at the higher levels.

THE HIGH-SCHOOL LIBRARY

A special committee of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of which Edwin L. Miller was chair-

man rendered a report at the recent meeting of the association on the libraries in the secondary schools accredited by the association. The elaborate tables presented in the report cannot be reproduced here. The following are the summary statements based on the tables.

1. The average score on nearly every item increases regularly from the small to the large schools, but there is always considerable overlapping between the distributions. Caution should be exercised in judging a school library solely with reference to the enrolment of the school.

2. The median number of volumes increases from 1,732 for the small schools to 8,375 for the large schools.

3. The median number of volumes per pupil decreases from eleven for the small schools to three for the large schools. The large schools can provide a much wider selection of titles at a lower cost per pupil.

4. The median number of pupils per library seat increases from five for the small schools to twenty-six for the large schools. Either the small schools are very wasteful of library space or the large schools are over-economical.

5. The median total score on the library score card ranges from 70 in the small schools to 83 in the large schools. No schools meet the standard completely, but the large schools approximate it more nearly than do the small schools. The average is less than 80 per cent of the standard.

6. Extra-curriculum use and supplementary rooms are the two characteristics in which the average school is lowest with reference to the standard. Granted that the standard is sound, schools generally need to improve their libraries in these regards.

7. Individual schools differ greatly in the particular characteristics of their libraries which lower their total score. Probably the greatest value of the survey will be the opportunity afforded principals of diagnosing and remedying the weaknesses of their own school libraries by comparison with the average for schools of their own size.

WHY COLLEGE FRESHMEN FAIL

J. Edward Allen, superintendent of the schools of Warren County, North Carolina, has summarized in a pamphlet entitled, *Freshman Mortality: A Symptom of Remediable Weaknesses*, the reasons which, according to his experience, explain why college Freshmen fail. Among the reasons which he enumerates is inferiority of high-school instruction. He enlarges on this point as follows:

This inferiority of high-school instruction is inevitably associated with several elements, among which are these:

1. The numerous and incongruous courses which certain teachers in secondary schools attempt to teach simultaneously—three, four, or five differ-

ent subjects being found in a single teacher's daily teaching load—suggest the possibility of vast improvement in the student's thoroughness of learning.

2. The employment in secondary schools not infrequently of teachers who themselves are none too familiar with the atmosphere and curricula of institutions of higher learning is both an entirely too common practice and totally unnecessary. The writer knows of teachers now engaged in preparing students for college who have never matriculated in any college nor done any work there except in summer session and for the completion of certification only.

3. Young men fresh from college are often sought out zealously as high-school teachers by principals or superintendents who set up as the sole criterion by which to judge them their ability to act as athletic coaches. Thereupon they are employed to teach curricular subjects, when one could easily ascertain that they barely passed their college courses, have knowledge of these wholly inadequate for the teaching of them, and are moreover without scientific knowledge of a teacher's duties beyond the minimum number of professional courses barely passed.

4. High-school libraries have often, by their inadequacy, unsuitability, or disuse, caused a salient weakness in a Freshman's preparation for college. No college student can be successful unless he somewhere learns to use to advantage a good library.

5. The habit of individual investigation has often not been developed through the absence, or unintelligent abuse, of high-school science-laboratory equipment and privileges. Teachers sometimes do all of the "laboratory" work if any is done and pupils none. Usually pupils merely follow directions blindly. The student thus has learned to do little or nothing upon his own initiative. This work, an extension of the "project curriculum" of the elementary school, is of inestimable importance.

MUSIC AS A PART OF GENERAL EDUCATION

The following paragraphs are quoted from the London *Times Educational Supplement.*

Signor Fedele, the Italian minister for education, in a recent letter to headmasters of secondary schools, has expressed the opinion that no one can be considered cultured who does not appreciate music, and that it is the duty of schools to cultivate and develop the innate musical sense of the young. All pupils, he says, in secondary schools should be given the opportunity of hearing good music, and headmasters are to arrange for a series of concerts to be given in each school during the winter months. Signor Fedele suggests that the help of the heads of the nearest schools of music be enlisted to obtain the co-operation of good performers and in arranging programs.

In a recent circular the minister draws the attention of prefects to the frequent complaints that the music of foreign composers is given too great prominence, to the detriment of Italian composers and music publishers, and directs

that at concerts, in cinemas, and at public performances at least half the program should consist of Italian music. In special cases, such as festivals in honor of some foreign composer and at certain theatrical performances, the rule may be waived.

The following paragraphs, quoted from the *New York Sun*, describe the method which is being tried in New York City to supply high-school pupils with musical training.

After-school classes in instrumental music without cost to the board of education are to be formed in the high schools under the supervision of George H. Gartlan, director of music, according to a plan presented by Mr. Gartlan and approved by the board of superintendents.

Under the plan classes of not more than five students are to be formed in various schools after regular hours. Instruction will be given at a cost not to exceed seventy-five cents a lesson. The instructors will be approved by Mr. Gartlan and by the superintendents. No principal or teacher in a school will be permitted to give such lessons, however.

Mr. Gartlan recommended this policy upon the petition of many faculty advisers of orchestras and glee clubs. Precedent exists in the authorization some years ago of after-school violin classes in the elementary schools. The chairmen of the music departments in the high schools will arrange hours and rooms for these instrumental classes.

"Many of our high-school teachers are anxious to organize instrumental classes for the various instruments of the orchestra," Mr. Gartlan reported. "There is precedent for this in the after-school violin classes. I have gone over this matter carefully with the chairmen of music departments in the high schools, and they are all agreeable. The principals and the chairmen of music departments will attend to all the physical arrangements. The teachers will be selected by us and carefully examined, and their names will be sent to the board of superintendents for approval."

CHANGES IN ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Several important changes have recently been made in the requirements for admission to the Freshman class of the University of Chicago. Up to 1923 the only qualitative requirement for entrance was an average mark in all academic subjects taken in high school higher than the passing mark of the school by at least 25 per cent of the difference between the passing mark and 100. Since 1923 a large amount of personal data has been required, and satisfactory evidence of desirable qualities other than scholarship has been a prerequisite to admission.

Beginning with the Freshman class of next autumn (1928) the qualitative requirements will be as follows:

1. Adequate personal qualifications, especially evidence of character, purpose, social adaptability, and intellectual and volitional maturity.

2. An average in academic subjects for the last three years higher than the passing mark of the school by at least 40 per cent of the difference between the passing mark and 100. Students who fail to meet this requirement and who meet the former 25 per cent standard may take a scholastic-aptitude test. If a satisfactory score is made in this test and all other factors are favorable, the student may be granted admission.

3. Not more than 750 new first-year students will be admitted for any autumn registration. At the opening of the winter and spring quarters admission will be limited to the number of those of the original 750 students who have withdrawn. Selection will be made on a strictly competitive basis.

4. In order to reserve a place in the list of students who may register in the autumn, an accepted applicant must deposit twenty-five dollars with the university. This sum will be credited on the fees of the first quarter in residence.

LOAN FUND SPONSORED BY A PARENT-TEACHER ASSOCIATION

Any high-school graduate in South Dakota who desires to attend an institution of higher education in the state and can obtain the indorsement of three responsible persons may borrow money from a student loan fund sponsored by the parent-teacher association of the state.

PRACTICAL ECONOMICS

The *New York Sun* published the following statement.

A type of education which will bear a closer relationship than the present academic training does to the everyday economic problems which confront men and women was urged by Orrin C. Lester, vice-president of the Bowery Savings Bank, in an address to the members of the metropolitan district of the New York State Congress of Parents and Teachers, at the annual spring conference held at the Hotel Commodore.

The speaker announced that as a first step toward the solution of this problem a committee of bankers is working on the preparation of a course in

practical economics, designed to give boys and girls a clearer realization of their economic responsibilities and equip them to carry these responsibilities successfully. If present plans mature, according to Mr. Lester, the state department of education will offer a tentative syllabus covering such a course within eight or nine months.

"There is an irreconcilable difference between what we teach children as public education," the speaker continued, "and what the business world and the world of experience asks them to do after they leave school. We have a greater amount of economic and social illiteracy than academic illiteracy in this country today.

"Isn't it just as important that my child should know something about how to manage his money affairs in life as it is that he should know geometry? A better understanding of economic values is essential to happiness in life, and I know of no place where it can be given effectively except in the public school, for that is the only institution organized for universal education.

"My definition of education is that it ought to give young people a sense of their personal responsibility in life. We need to get into the public schools of this country a course that will take its place in value alongside any other in the curriculum, a course that will give boys and girls a sense of their economic responsibility and that will overcome the criticism that education is too far removed from the common problems of life. This course, which is now being planned, will be only one step in the reconciliation of the education of children to the actual things they are called upon to do after leaving school."

EXAMINATIONS IN ENGLISH SCHOOLS

England more than any other country has developed the examination system of determining the advancement of pupils of all levels. There is at the present time a reaction against the examination system. Recent issues of the *Christian Science Monitor* contain items from which two extracts may be quoted.

The following paragraphs are from an address by Sir Michael E. Sadler.

We are in danger of spoiling our education by thinking too much about examinations and by failing to watch very closely the effects of our system of examinations on both the teachers and those who are taught.

I fear that the great machine of examinations pushes us helplessly farther and farther along the wrong road and away from the possibility of making English education consonant with the creative faculties of many English individuals. Inert ideas are at a premium. To implant them is the cheapest way of giving what looks like a liberal education. But inert ideas are a blight on the individual and the individual judgment.

A liberal education should make us sensitive and keep us creative. Unless it keeps us creative, it is disabling. The more widely we spread the disabling

kind of education, the more we weaken the intellectual and moral power of the English people.

The second extract is as follows:

A movement against cramming in British schools, designed to make the transference of children from primary to secondary schools less dependent upon that mechanical form of training, has been set on foot, the promoters having devised what they believe to be a more reliable method of selection.

The children in question are those attending primary schools in England and Wales, who, at the age of eleven or twelve, are selected by means of an annual examination for transference to secondary schools for a course of higher education extending to the age of sixteen. Only a small proportion of the children are chosen, and it has been found that some of the successful candidates—those who have gained place through cramming—fail afterward to justify their selection.

To remedy this state of affairs, it is proposed that a proportion of the scholarships shall be awarded by primary head teachers on the ground of character and general merit, the rest to be awarded on the result of an examination set by a joint committee of authorities of the secondary and primary schools.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

Two bulletins which are of special interest to students of secondary education have recently been issued by the Bureau of Educational Research of the University of Illinois. The first is entitled, *Two Illustrations of Curriculum Construction*, and describes the technique employed in two studies and the results of these studies. One study resulted in a curriculum in physical education for high-school boys; the other, in a curriculum in horticulture for the high school.

The second bulletin is entitled, *A Glossary of Three Hundred Terms Used in Educational Measurement and Research.* The use of this glossary will facilitate intelligent reading of technical articles. The bulletin can also be consulted with advantage by many who write such articles.

A CHARM CLASS

A "charm class" for the cultivation of good manners, taste in dress, voice, good English, and other attributes of personal charm that are of practical importance to business and professional women has been organized in the night school of the Lafayette Junior High School, Los Angeles, California.

THE JUNIOR-COLLEGE MOVEMENT IN CALIFORNIA

W. J. COOPER
State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Sacramento, California

In terms of statutes alone, the California junior college attains its majority this year. Although the period of twenty-one years may be divided into three parts, there is an earlier period of rather indefinite length which deserves mention. Accordingly, four periods are considered in the following outline.

1. THE BIRTH OF AN IDEA IN CALIFORNIA (PRIOR TO 1907)

The first period has been succinctly summarized by the late Alexis F. Lange, dean of the School of Education, University of California, who is thought by many to be the "father of the California junior-college idea." Addressing the University of Chicago conference with secondary schools on April 10, 1917, Dean Lange said:

> Since 1892 the state university [University of California] has been gradually reshaping itself around two organizing ideas. One was and is that, for theoretical and practical considerations alike, the university proper should begin in the middle of the inherited four-year college scheme; the second was and is that the work of the first two years is as a matter of history and fact all of a piece with secondary education. This trend of thought and preaching and practice resulted *gradatim* in the junior certificate, to mark the distinction between university and secondary education; in the policy of placing all professional schools on a basis of not less than two years of non-professional training; in making the studies of the last two years of the high school and the first two of the college largely interchangeable; and last, but not least, in publicly exhibiting the requirements for the junior certificate in terms of unified secondary curricula covering Grades 9–14, inclusive. In ways of her own, Leland Stanford Junior University, under the leadership first of Dr. Jordan and now of Dr. Wilbur, stands committed to virtually the same policy.[1]

The influence of David Starr Jordan referred to in the preceding paragraph had been evaluated as follows by Dean Lange in an article published nearly two years before the Chicago conference:

[1] Alexis Frederick Lange, *The Lange Book*, p. 107. Edited by Arthur H. Chamberlain. San Francisco, California: San Francisco Trade Publishing Co., 1927. See also "The Junior College as an Integral Part of the Public-School System," *School Review*, XXV (September, 1917), 469–70.

But this propaganda would probably not have gathered momentum very fast without President Jordan's dynamic articles and addresses urging the amputation of Freshmen and Sophomore classes to prevent university atrophy and urging the relegation of these classes to the high school. His advocacy of its upward extension made the public "sit up and take notice" and thought and prodded school men into taking the initiative. What had been a Berkeley idea at the beginning had become a California idea. . . . . Moreover, while Berkeleyans had been in the habit of speaking of six-year high schools, Dr. Jordan gave general currency to the name "junior college," and this proved much more potent in suggestible communities.[1]

When the writer matriculated in the University of California in August, 1902, as a student in the College of Letters (Classical A.B. degree course), the requirements for graduation were outlined as follows:[2]

a) Prescribed (fundamental) studies: To be completed, if possible, during the first two years of residence.....	59
b) The group elective: Advanced studies in one subject, or not more than two cognate subjects, chosen from one of the groups indicated; . . . . and subject to the prerequisites required and announced by the departments concerned.....	24
c) Free electives: To be chosen at any period of the undergraduate course, in any of the departments of instruction at Berkeley, subject to any sequence of studies required and announced by the departments concerned.....	42
Total.....	125

In May, 1906, the writer left the University of California with the A.B. degree obtained under an entirely different plan of work, which had been adopted by the university in December, 1902. The reasons for this change are explained by President Benjamin Ide Wheeler in his biennial report to the governor of California:

The group elective was originally intended to guarantee the restriction of at least a portion of the elective area to coherent and specialized work. With the development of the university, however, and the widening of the range of studies, this provision became gradually ineffective or meaningless. The groups came to be more or less arbitrary. It became necessary gradually to in-

[1] Alexis Frederick Lange, *The Lange Book*, pp. 119–20. See also "The Junior College with Special Reference to California," *Educational Administration and Supervision*, II (January, 1916), 3.

[2] *University of California Register, 1902–1903*, pp. 104–5. University of California Bulletin, New Series, Vol. V, No. 1. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1903.

crease the proportion of free electives. Furthermore, the three divisions—prescribed studies, group electives, free electives—came more and more to be entangled with each other in the arrangement of the individual students' courses of study. Though the group elective should normally be reserved for the end of the course, Seniors might frequently be found struggling with fragments of all three.

The old plan, after having served an excellent purpose during a period of transition, had become inadequate. It had developed two prime defects. The distinction between group elective and free elective had become ineffective and effete. The elementary work both of substance and method was confused with advanced work, the advancement of the student being reckoned too much in terms of units, too little in terms of maturity.

The new plan proposes a clear line of demarcation between the elementary work as normally done in the first two years and the advanced work belonging to the last two years.[1]

If President Wheeler foresaw any influences of the new plan on the educational system of the state other than on the University of California itself, he did not mention them in the report. The expected effect on the university he set forth in these words:

The insistence upon the completion of certain prescribed and elementary work before entrance upon the work of the two final years creates between what will be virtually a lower college and an upper college a marked distinction which it is intended and expected shall express itself in sharp differentiation of methods both of teaching and study. The work required after the granting of the mid-course certificate, namely, not less than forty-eight units or more than sixty, must be extended over a period of not less than two years of residence. This is intended as a discouragement upon hurry and superficiality. The average number of hours per week can vary only between twelve and fifteen. This encourages the instructor to expect ampler preparation and reading on the part of his students.[2]

2. THE INFANCY OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGE IN CALIFORNIA (1907–17)

The geography of the state of California rather than educational leadership seems to be responsible for the first legislation making possible postgraduate high-school work in the public schools of the state. The first law, passed by the legislature of 1907, was written by Senator Anthony Caminetti, of Amador County. It made no provision for any financial aid on the part of the state. The text of this law is as follows:

[1] *Biennial Report of the President of the University of California, 1900–1902*, pp. 69–70. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1902.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 70–71.

The board of trustees of any city, district, union, joint union, or county high school may prescribe postgraduate courses of study for the graduates of such high school, or other high schools, which courses of study shall approximate the studies prescribed in the first two years of university courses. The board of trustees of any city, district, union, joint union, or county high school wherein the postgraduate courses of study are taught may charge tuition for pupils living without the boundaries of the district wherein such courses are taught.[1]

The first school system to take advantage of this law was the city of Fresno in 1910–11 during the superintendency of Charles L. McLane. Looking backward on the early stages of the movement, McLane wrote as follows in 1913:

Geographic-educational conditions in California are such as to demand that the public-school system, in many sections of the state, shall meet the requirements for advanced training above the four-year high-school course. . . . .

The element of distance is a most important factor to the individual in planning his educational career. Even though the financial consideration of railroad fare be overcome, a parent will often hesitate to send his child so far from home that one or possibly two visits a year only are possible. Parents are justly concerned as to the advisability of severing home ties and the home restraints that should often continue for some years after the age of graduation from the high school as this latter institution is commonly organized in the United States. Some towns in California are almost as far, on an air line, from either of the universities as Chicago is from New York, and many are much farther by the nearest railroad. . . . .

The first movement toward making use of this "upward extension" law was made by the city superintendent of the Fresno schools in June, 1910, when a circular letter was sent to patrons of the Fresno High School and to the principals of various other nearby high schools. Over two hundred favorable replies were received with not one adverse opinion.[2]

As a result of this approval, the Fresno High School board established a postgraduate course and maintained such instruction until 1917, when it established a junior-college course under the provisions of the Ballard Act of that year. The Fresno postgraduate high-school course opened with fifteen students in 1910–11 and increased steadily as shown by the following enrolment figures: 1910–11, 15; 1911–12, 15; 1912–13, 35; 1913–14, 46; 1914–15, 77; 1915–16, 117; and 1916–17, 79.[3]

[1] *Statutes of California, 1907*, chap. 69, p. 88.

[2] C. L. McLane, "The Junior College, or Upward Extension of the High School," *School Review*, XXI (March, 1913), 161–63.

[3] The loss in 1916–17 was due to war conditions.

In the year 1911–12 the Santa Barbara High School, under the principalship of A. C. Olney, who had been principal of the Fresno High School at the time its postgraduate course was planned, established a postgraduate department. During the same year a postgraduate course was offered in the Los Angeles High School. The following year (1912–13) the Bakersfield and Fullerton high schools established similar courses.

When the legislature met in 1917, there were sixteen high schools in the state that were interested in promoting legislation to provide for state and county aid for postgraduate high-school courses, which until that time had been maintained entirely at local-district expense. These sixteen high schools reported to the state superintendent of public instruction a total enrolment of 1,259 postgraduate students during the school year 1916–17. This represented an average of seventy-nine students to each high school. The smallest enrolment was in the Pomona High School, which had only three students; and the largest was in the Los Angeles High School, which had 520 students.

At the University of California during these years the organization of a lower division and an upper division was taking definite form, and at the same time the line of demarcation between high-school courses and lower-division courses was breaking down.

That the University of California was not out of sympathy with this high-school upward-extension movement seems evidenced by notes on the requirements for the junior certificate which appear in the "registers" of the university. In the register for the academic year 1907–08 and in each subsequent register until the reorganization of the university colleges in the academic year 1914–15 is a table defining requirements "for the junior certificate, including matriculation." The total is 109 units, 45 of which were to be taken in the high school and the other 64 in the university.

High-school pupils expecting to matriculate were allowed much latitude in planning their work. During this period it was possible for a pupil, by the careful arrangement of high-school courses, to complete all work in English required for the junior certificate except the examination known as "English A." Likewise, it was possible for a high-school pupil to complete all the mathematics re-

quired for the junior certificate in all colleges except the technical colleges and the College of Commerce. In the natural sciences also a large part of the prescribed work might be completed in the high school.

Even in the colleges requiring much work in science a liberal attitude prevailed, as indicated by the following note.

> Students in the College of Natural Sciences or Agriculture must include at east one course in physics, one course in chemistry, and one course in astronomy, botany, geography, geology, physiology, or zoölogy selected from the matriculation or college courses named.[1]

In 1914 the University of California changed its internal organization by combining the old colleges of letters, social sciences, and natural sciences into a single college. That the liberal arrangement described influenced this action seems to be implied in the annual report of the president of the university dated December, 1915. President Wheeler explained the change in policy as follows:

> With the increasing complication of courses of study, the boundaries between the colleges were becoming constantly more vague and uncertain. Especially had it come to be the case that students were assigned for graduation to this or that college more on a basis of what they studied in the high school than of what they had studied in the university; and, on the other hand, chose their college all too frequently rather on the basis of what studies they sought to avoid than of what they wanted to take.
>
> With the beginning of this year, therefore, the three "colleges of general culture"—Letters, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences—were consolidated into one new college, called the College of Letters and Science. The studies within this college lead all its students to the degree of Bachelor of Arts (A.B.).[2]

The register for the academic year 1914–15 does not contain the table which first appeared in the register for 1907–08. Nevertheless, a relation between the forty-five units required for matriculation and the sixty-four units required in the lower division is indicated by the retention of the total of 109 units for the junior certificate, and various notes indicate no intention of abandoning the earlier policy of breaking down the barrier between high-school work and lower-division work. Among such notes are the following.

[1] *University of California Register, 1907–08–09*, p. 109. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1909.

[2] *Annual Report of the President of the University of California, 1914–1915*, p. 21. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1915.

Courses in foreign language given in the university at the rate of 5 units per half-year will be credited as 6 units toward the foreign-language minimum but only as 5 units toward the total matriculation requirement of 45 units or the junior-certificate requirement of 64 units.[1]

It will be noticed that the new plan demands 6 units of laboratory work in science—either matriculation work or college work, or both.[2]

In July, 1915, the University of California published a circular prepared by the Committee on Courses of Instruction of the academic senate, entitled, *The Junior College in California*.[3] In this bulletin the committee suggested standards for the purpose of meeting what it conceived to be the main problems of the junior college. These problems had to do with faculty, equipment, curriculum, and relation to the high school and to the University of California. In the prefatory note the following statement appears.

The whole matter, in every aspect, is in a state of transition. The junior college stands at the very beginning of its career; and the lower division of the university is undergoing important changes and facing many unsolved problems of its own. It has been with the utmost reluctance that many departments have committed themselves to definite statements of policy or advice.[4]

Despite the reluctance of the departments to commit themselves to definite statements, the committee expressed in the following words what it considered to be the university's attitude toward the junior college.

The University of California regards the last two years of the high school and the first two of the college as largely interchangeable and has found it necessary to offer a number of courses equivalent to matriculation subjects, designated, in the announcement, by letters instead of numbers, such as German AB, French AB, and Mathematics A. Such courses are appropriate in the junior college, in the lower division of the university, or in the high school. Certainly the student should be permitted to take them at any time before his Junior year, or even later, should the need arise.[5]

This expression of the attitude of the University of California toward the junior college was reiterated by the university examiner,

[1] *University of California Register, 1914–15*, Part I, p. 106. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1915.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 107.

[3] Revised and published as *The Junior College Bulletin* in 1918 and 1926.

[4] *The Junior College in California*, p. 6. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1915.

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 14–15.

Baldwin M. Woods, in an address before the California High School Teachers' Association at the very close of this period. Mr. Woods spoke as follows:

> The University of California is one of a small number of institutions in this country which formally divides its undergraduate work into upper- and lower-division curricula. Moreover, it goes farther than this by considering the work of the lower division as an extension of the high-school training so that the specific requirements for the junior certificate may be met by studies carried either in the high school, the college, or in both.[1]

3. THE ADOLESCENCE OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGE IN CALIFORNIA (1917–21)

In his biennial report for 1914–16, Will C. Wood, commissioner of secondary schools, referring to the law of 1907 providing for postgraduate high-school courses, said:

> It will be observed that no specific provision for maintenance is made in the law. Practically all of the districts which have established postgraduate courses have raised the expense of maintenance by district taxation. . . . .
>
> The time has arrived when the postgraduate or junior-college department should be placed upon a more satisfactory financial basis. A more comprehensive law concerning the organization of postgraduate courses should be placed upon the statute books, and this law should contain the provision that the average daily attendance of students enrolled in such courses shall be counted in estimating the amount of state and county high-school revenues. Apportionments should be made on account of attendance on postgraduate courses in the same manner as apportionments are made on account of attendance on regular high-school courses.
>
> Provision should be made also that, wherever students residing in a county where junior-college privileges are not provided attend postgraduate courses maintained in a school of an adjoining county, the attendance of such pupils shall be reported to the county superintendent of schools of the county in which such students reside, and the county superintendent shall include in the estimate of county high-school fund required an amount computed at $60 for each student so attending. This amount should be transferred to the credit of the school in which the students are enrolled. If such provision is made, the clause relating to the payment of tuition should be stricken out. The junior college is a part of our public-school system, and tuition therein should be free.[2]

[1] B. M. Woods, "Articulation of Junior College and High School Curricula," *Sierra Educational News*, XIII (July–August, 1917), 91.

[2] Will C. Wood, "Biennial Report of the Commissioner of Secondary Schools," *Second Biennial Report of the State Board of Education, 1914–1916*, pp. 163–64. Sacramento, California: California State Printing Office, 1916.

An act embodying these recommendations of Commissioner Wood was introduced into the 1917 legislature by Senator Ballard as Senate Bill 514 and was enacted into law as Section 1750*b* of the Political Code. Before the law became operative, however, the United States had entered the World War. The effect of the war on the junior colleges was noted by Commissioner A. C. Olney in his 1920 report to the state board of education in these words:

> Upon the entrance of the United States into the war in 1917, nearly every young man among the junior-college students was in the draft. The result was the elimination of several struggling institutions. Others were left with very few in attendance.[1]

During the period beginning with the 1917 law and ending with the 1921 Junior College Act (1917–21) twenty-seven high-school junior-college departments were established. Sixteen of these had been maintained prior to 1917 as postgraduate high-school courses. During this same period twelve junior-college departments were discontinued, two of the twelve being re-established before 1921, making the total number of high schools which maintained junior-college departments just one greater than the number which maintained postgraduate courses prior to the 1917 law. Of the ten junior-college courses which were discontinued during this period, nine were discontinued permanently, the tenth being re-established after the war period. The total enrolment in junior-college courses for the school year ending June 30, 1921, was 1,442, representing a decrease of 119 during the four-year period. The average enrolment in each course, however, increased from seventy-four to eighty-five during the same period.

The attitude of the University of California, as reflected in the 1918 revision of *The Junior College Bulletin*, continued to be friendly. This bulletin, which was prepared under authority of the academic senate by the Credentials Committee, "whose duty it is to appraise the credits of students entering the university," makes the following statement.

> It is the university's policy to give a year's credit for a year's work on the basis of credentials from other colleges, including junior colleges. Whenever the

[1] A. C. Olney, "Biennial Report of the Commissioner of Secondary Schools," *Fourth Biennial Report of the State Board of Education, 1918–1920*, p. 179. Sacramento, California: California State Printing Office, 1921.

junior college has been placed on the approved list, the university will endeavor to give thirty-two units (slightly more in the engineering colleges) and to distribute these thirty-two units in a way that will equitably meet requirements for the junior certificate and the Bachelor's degree.[1]

4. THE YOUTH OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGE IN CALIFORNIA (1921–28)

The fourth period opens with the report of the Special Legislative Committee on Education[2] to the California legislature of 1921 and the law[3] which resulted therefrom.

Analyzing the growth of the high schools in total enrolment and number of graduates and the mounting enrolment at the state university, the committee predicted twenty thousand students in the University of California in 1935 unless some change in policy was inaugurated.

To concentrate such numbers of students as will in the future seek collegiate education in this state largely at one place, the committee felt would be both expensive and decidedly unwise, considered from almost every point of view. To develop one or more duplicate state universities would cost still more, because the duplicate library and laboratory equipment is very expensive and often almost impossible. After careful consideration of the whole question, the committee felt that any wise policy for the development of higher educational advantages in this state calls for a scattering of the students in their earlier years, while they are in need of closer supervision for both their studies and their morals, and a concentration of the upper and more expensive work in one high-grade university.[4]

As a partial solution of this problem, the development of the normal schools into teachers' colleges with power to grant degrees and to offer courses of college grade in specified subjects was advised, and the following recommendations were made.

1. The development at first of a junior college in connection with each normal school, unless there should be good reasons for not duplicating a previous city junior-college development, covering lower-division work much as at the state university, and parallel with the professional courses for the training of teachers.

[1] *The Junior College Bulletin*, p. 11. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1918.

[2] *Report of the Special Legislative Committee on Education* (Herbert C. Jones, chairman), especially chap. iv. Sacramento, California: California State Printing Office, 1920.

[3] *Statutes of California, 1921*, chap. 495. Commonly known as Act 1477 (Deering).

[4] *Report of the Special Legislative Committee on Education*, p. 76.

2. The segregation of the lower-division work at the state university into a junior college.

3. The development in connection with the high schools of a series of supplemental junior colleges, in addition to those in connection with the teachers' colleges, at a number of well-located points in this state, these also to give lower-division work, and their students to pass to the teachers' colleges or to the state university for further collegiate or professional work.[1]

The recommendations for amendment of the existing law (Political Code, Section 1750*b*) were for the most part accepted by the legislature but were enacted into a new statute.[2] The old law was left unchanged. The new statute, commonly called the "Junior College Act," provided for the formation of a new quasi-municipal corporation, to be known as a "junior-college district." This law, as amended in the legislature of 1927,[3] provides for junior-college districts of five types.

1. The junior-college district coterminous with a high-school district.

2. The union junior-college district, embracing two or more contiguous high-school districts in the same county.

3. The joint union junior-college district, embracing two or more contiguous counties.

4. The county junior-college district, embracing all territory of the county not included in any other type of junior-college district.

5. The joint county junior-college district, comprising all the territory in two or more contiguous counties.

To form a district of any of these types, the area to be incorporated must contain a high-school population of not less than four hundred in average daily attendance and show an assessed valuation of at least $10,000,000.

The effect of this legislation on the junior-college movement is shown in Table I. It will be observed that the total enrolment in high-school junior-college departments increased more than 20 per cent from 1922 to 1927 in spite of the fact that the larger schools have organized separate districts for college purposes. The colleges organized under the 1921 law increased from two in the first year to thirteen in 1927, enrolling 5,773 students October 1, 1927. Three

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 76–78.

[2] *Statutes of California, 1921*, chap. 495.

[3] *Statutes of California, 1927*, chap. 708.

more districts are in process of formation and have been approved by the state board of education, namely, San Jose, Compton, and Ventura County.

This addition to the secondary-school population coupled with the greater interest in special day and evening classes has increased the California secondary-school enrolment even more rapidly than was anticipated by the legislative committee of 1921.

TABLE I

GROWTH OF JUNIOR COLLEGES IN CALIFORNIA FROM 1917–18 TO 1927–28

YEAR	HIGH SCHOOL JUNIOR-COLLEGE COURSES*					JUNIOR-COLLEGE DISTRICTS†		TOTAL JUNIOR COLLEGES	
	New	Re-established	Discontinued	Total	State Enrolment	Number	State Enrolment	Number	State Enrolment
1917–18	21	.....	.....	21	1,561	.....	.....	21	1,561
1918–19	1	.....	4	18	1,255	.....	.....	18	1,255
1919–20	2	1	4	17	1,096	.....	.....	17	1,096
1920–21	3	1	4	17	1,442	.....	.....	17	1,442
1921–22	5	1	2‡	21	2,013	2‡	246	23	2,259
1922–23	3	.....	6§	18	1,416	7§	1,427	25	2,843
1923–24	.....	1	2	17	1,618	7	2,391	24	4,009
1924–25	1	.....	.....	18	1,944	8	3,327	26	5,271
1925–26	2	.....	.....	20	2,293	8	3,479	28	5,772
1926–27	2	.....	1	21	2,488	10	5,585	31	8,073
1927–28‖	4	.....	5‡	20	2,400	13‡	5,773	33	8,173

* Established under Section 1750*b*, Political Code, enacted 1917.
† Established under Act 1477 (Deering), General Laws of California, enacted 1921.
‡ One high-school junior-college course converted into district junior college.
§ Four high-school junior-college courses converted into district junior colleges in 1922–23.
‖ Data for 1927–28 as of October 1, 1927.

During this period (1921–28) the increase in the number of students transferring to the University of California, whose credits require examination by department heads, the numerous calls of junior-college principals for advice as to curriculums, libraries, equipment, etc., and the insistent demand for trained teachers have combined to make the state university keenly aware of a "junior-college problem."

It is thought by many school administrators that the policy of the university concerning credit for junior-college courses as expressed in *The Junior College Bulletin* of August, 1926, is a little less cordial than that expressed in 1918 (see pp. 417–18). The opening sentences of the statement of policy now read as follows:

Junior-college students will present their credentials to the recorder of the faculties. These credentials will be evaluated by the university examiner ac-

cording to the general policy of the university in granting credit to students entering from other institutions of higher learning.[1]

A more complete statement, however, is to be found in President Campbell's report to the regents. A note of caution is sounded but no note of hostility.

> The attitude of the university to the junior-college movement in California is thoroughly friendly and sympathetic, but this attitude is not unconditional. The university is glad to see junior colleges established in communities possessing the population and the financial resources that will make possible the development of institutions of high quality; and, on the other hand, the university would view with regret any proposal to establish a junior college in a region of small population and small wealth. . . . . We anticipate that within ten or fifteen years the junior colleges will have increased somewhat in number, and greatly in attendance, with inverse effects upon the number of students in our Freshman and Sophomore years. But I advise with all the emphasis of which I am capable that we do not attempt to bring these results about suddenly; results achieved in that manner would certainly be exceedingly unfortunate for all institutions concerned: the junior colleges as well as the state university and other colleges and universities. . . . . The wise plan would provide for gradual approach to the objective . . . . with opportunities for all institutions concerned to adapt themselves to the changing state of affairs.[2]

The problems involved, however, are such that they cannot be solved by the University of California alone. They require patient co-operative effort on the part of the university, the junior colleges, and the state department of education.

"The junior college," said Dean Lange in 1918, "will function adequately only if its first concern is with those who will go no farther, if it meets local needs efficiently, if it turns many away from the university into vocations for which training has not hitherto been afforded by our school system."[3]

At the present time few of the junior colleges have realized in any large way the dean's vision, although some of them—particularly the Chaffey Union Junior College at Ontario—have made splendid progress in this direction. The University of California itself frankly admits that this work is outside its jurisdiction and interest. In

[1] *The Junior College Bulletin*, p. 8. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1926.

[2] *Annual Report of the President of the University of California*, pp. xiii–xiv. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1927.

[3] Alexis Frederick Lange, *The Lange Book*, p. 122. See also "The Junior College with Special Reference to California," *Educational Administration and Supervision*, II (January, 1916), 4–5.

The Junior College Bulletin it is stated clearly that "no attempt is made here to consider the problem faced by the junior colleges in the satisfaction of local needs or the offering of vocational training."[1] The state department of education has not had a sufficient staff to direct the junior colleges adequately. The state board of education has indicated that curriculums of three types may be developed, namely, (1) the junior-certificate course, intended primarily for students who will continue in the upper division of the university; (2) courses especially stressing civic problems, intended for students who will not continue their higher education farther (often called the "diploma course"); (3) the vocational course, intended to prepare students for immediate participation in vocational pursuits.

TABLE II

ENROLMENT IN CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGES BY YEARS FROM 1917–18 TO 1926–27

Year	Number of First-Year Students	Number of Second-Year Students	Number of Special Students	Total
1917–18	1,322	239	.....	1,561
1918–19	1,028	227	.....	1,255
1919–20	877	219	.....	1,096
1920–21	1,184	258	.....	1,442
1921–22	1,660	450	149	2,259
1922–23	2,007	624	212	2,843
1923–24	2,182	925	902	4,009
1924–25	2,940	1,051	1,280	5,271
1925–26	3,714	1,252	806	5,772
1926–27	3,957	1,710	2,406	8,073

The extremely rapid increase in the numbers of students enrolling in other than the university preparatory course is indicated by the figures shown in Table II. Recognizing the necessity for caring more adequately for the needs of these students, who will terminate their higher education in the junior colleges, the division of city secondary schools of the state department of education recently issued a bulletin suggesting standards and content for junior-college terminal courses.[2] Adequately providing for these students constitutes one of the major phases of the junior-college problem in California.

[1] *The Junior College Bulletin*, p. 3. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1926.

[2] Nicholas Ricciardi, *The Need for Terminal Courses in the Junior College*. Bulletin No. C-6. Sacramento, California: Division of City Secondary Schools, State Department of Education, 1927.

THE METHOD OF SELECTING THE MEMBERS OF THE HIGH-SCHOOL HONOR SOCIETY

WILLIAM C. REAVIS
University of Chicago

The rapid growth of the National Honor Society in the secondary schools of the United States and the general acceptance of the principles underlying the organization make necessary the study of a number of problems that have arisen in its administration, the chief of which is the method of selecting the members. The governing board, or National Council, of the National Honor Society has not outlined the specific method to be followed by the local schools in choosing the members of the organization; it has, however, specified the criteria to be employed and the percentile group of the class from which the members are to be selected. The general procedure[1] usually adopted in the local schools is as follows: (1) The principal submits to the faculty the names of the Seniors whose scholastic marks place them in the highest fourth[2] of the class. (2) A committee of the faculty appointed by the principal considers the merits of these pupils in accordance with four criteria—scholarship, service, leadership, and character—and recommends for election a number not to exceed 15 per cent of the membership of the Senior class.[3] (3) The faculty votes on the report of the committee.

The method of selection indicated raises the following questions. (1) Does the highest third of the class as determined by course marks

[1] Found by Paul W. Terry and C. E. Hagie in a sampling study of eighty-two schools. Reported in "Practices of Local Chapters of the National Honor Society," *Extra-curricular Activities*, pp. 149–56. Twenty-fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Co., 1926.

[2] At the meeting of the National Council of the National Honor Society on February 26, 1927, the constitution was changed to provide for election from the highest third of the class instead of the highest fourth.

[3] Five per cent of the high Junior class may be selected if desired.

contain all the pupils most worthy of scholastic recognition? (2) Is a committee of the faculty or even the faculty as a whole able to evaluate sufficiently accurately by subjective methods alone the relative merits of pupils in service, leadership, and character? (3) Should the judgment of the pupils' classmates on citizenship qualities be obtained and taken into consideration by the faculty committee in choosing the members of the honor society? (4) Does not the method of selection require on the part of the governing board of the National Honor Society more specific formulation of procedures than the present method provides to insure the confidence of both pupils and parents in the administration of the society?

It is not the purpose of the writer to attack the principle of restricting the consideration of membership in the honor society to pupils who have achieved high standing in course marks. The National Honor Society is intended, first of all, to give recognition to superior scholarship. High marks constitute one of the important evidences of scholastic worth but not the sole evidence. In changing the constitution to permit consideration of pupils in the highest third of the class instead of the highest fourth as determined by scholastic marks, the governing board of the society has made possible the avoidance of injustices which the earlier requirement might have imposed. It is now hardly conceivable that any pupil deserving of consideration for recognition on the ground of superior scholarship would be unable to qualify under the requirement for course marks. However, the fact that the range from which the selection of members may be made is now greater imposes a heavier responsibility on the nominating committee. It makes imperative the collection of supplementary data on both scholarship and citizenship qualities if a wise selection of members is to be made. The intellectual interests and the creative ability of the pupils as well as their course marks should be known, and a rating of their personal qualities by many persons in addition to the judgment of a select committee should be secured before the important function of selecting or rejecting the pupils eligible to membership in the honor society is exercised.

The plan used for the past three years in the University High School, University of Chicago, to select members of the honor so-

ciety[1] provides some data for the evaluation of the change made at the annual meeting of the National Council of the National Honor Society in February, 1927, and for the further improvement of the method of selecting members of the National Honor Society. First, the method of determining the rank of the pupils is based not on averages of course marks alone but on composite scores[2] derived from course marks, ratings by the faculty on intellectual interests, ratings by the faculty on school citizenship, and ratings by the pupils' classmates on school citizenship. Second, a committee consisting of all the members of the faculty who have served the school for four or more years elect not more than 10 per cent of the total membership of the Junior and Senior classes on the basis of the highest third of the composite scores.

Five summaries of case ratings are presented in Table I to show the merits of the plan. Pupil 1 led both classes in composite score. He was subsequently elected president of the honor society. Pupil 2 ranked near the bottom of the highest third of his class in course marks but in the upper eighth in composite score. In intellectual interests he was virtually as high as Pupil 1. Pupil 3 ranked in the upper eighth of her class in course marks, but her other ratings were so low that her composite score placed her in the middle third of her class. On course marks alone she would have been entitled to strong consideration for membership in the honor society and in the absence of definite ratings on the other criteria would in all probability have been elected. The value of the supplementary ratings is clearly shown in the comparison of two Juniors, Pupils 4 and 5. On course marks both were in the highest third of the class, but on composite score Pupil 4 ranked in the highest tenth while Pupil 5 ranked in the tenth below the highest. If definite supplementary

[1] The honor society of the University High School is not a chapter of the National Honor Society although it conforms very closely to the rules and regulations of this organization.

[2] The percentages are computed for the high, medium, and low ratings of each pupil on course marks, intellectual interests, citizenship as judged by the faculty, and citizenship as judged by the pupil's classmates. The sums of the percentages are averaged, and the average percentage of high ratings is multiplied by 3; the average percentage of medium ratings, by 2; and the average percentage of low ratings, by 1. The sum of the three weighted averages is the composite score.

data had not been available for consideration, the chance of Pupil 5 for election would have been approximately as good as that of

TABLE I

INDIVIDUAL RATINGS EMPLOYED IN SELECTING MEMBERS OF THE HONOR SOCIETY OF THE UNIVERSITY HIGH SCHOOL, UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

	High		Medium		Low	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Pupil 1 (Senior; composite score, 270):						
Course marks	7	29	17	71	0	0
Faculty on intellectual interests	10	83	2	17	0	0
Faculty on citizenship	8	89	1	11	0	0
Classmates on citizenship	48	80	12	20	0	0
Total	.....	281	.....	119	.....	0
Average	.....	70	.....	30	.....	0
Pupil 2 (Senior; composite score, 244.5):						
Course marks	2	5	37	95	0	0
Faculty on intellectual interests	11	79	3	21	0	0
Faculty on citizenship	4	33	8	67	0	0
Classmates on citizenship	36	59	24	39	1	2
Total	.....	176	.....	222	.....	2
Average	.....	44	.....	56	.....	0.5
Pupil 3 (Senior; composite score, 187):						
Course marks	7	21	26	76	1	3
Faculty on intellectual interests	0	0	5	63	3	37
Faculty on citizenship	1	14	5	72	1	14
Classmates on citizenship	1	2	27	66	13	32
Total	.....	37	.....	277	.....	86
Average	.....	9	.....	69	.....	22
Pupil 4 (Junior; composite score, 238):						
Course marks	2	7	28	93	0	0
Faculty on intellectual interests	7	70	3	30	0	0
Faculty on citizenship	5	63	3	37	0	0
Classmates on citizenship	8	18	30	67	7	15
Total	.....	158	.....	227	.....	15
Average	.....	40	.....	57	.....	4
Pupil 5 (Junior; composite score, 229):						
Course marks	2	12	13	76	2	12
Faculty on intellectual interests	6	55	3	27	2	18
Faculty on citizenship	5	50	5	50	0	0
Classmates on citizenship	20	44	20	44	6	12
Total	.....	161	.....	197	.....	42
Average	.....	40	.....	49	.....	11

Pupil 4. The supplementary ratings and the following subject reports reveal the qualitative superiority of Pupil 4.

SUBJECT REPORTS OF PUPIL 4

Latin 3.—A reliable, accurate pupil who does excellent work. He quickly grasps the thought of a Latin selection, is accurate in his grammar work, and stands very high in his tests. He is a gratifying pupil.

French 2 B.—This pupil has a remarkable intellect. His attitude is fine, so that from the teacher's point of view he has everything that could be desired. He has done some outside reading in addition to the requirements of the course.

Physics.—This pupil is a very diligent worker, doing everything well and within the time specified. His written work is well done and requires few corrections. He requires little help in any of his work.

Modern history.—The work of this pupil in history has been excellent. His power of application is good; his written work needs little revision; his test scores indicate mastery. His power of oral expression should be improved. Thus far most of his time has been absorbed in mastering the minimal essentials, but he is now at the point where he can well undertake additional work.

SUBJECT REPORTS OF PUPIL 5

Mechanical drawing.—This pupil has completed the minimum essentials in mechanical drawing in a very commendable manner. His work has been exceptionally well done from the standpoint of technique, thought content, and analysis. Up to this point he has shown no inclination to do supplementary work.

Mathematics III.—This pupil has shown a great deal of improvement in his work. He has done all the required work and in addition has selected and completed a project of his own. His problem was a discussion of the properties of the trigonometric functions based on their graphical representation.

Classics.—This pupil attains credit level by completing the minimum essentials of the course. He is capable of more steady application to work. His reading is not varied. He writes with competent ability.

Modern history.—The work of this pupil is an improvement over that of last year. Now and then he fails to attack a problem with promptness and perseverance. This tendency, however, is much less pronounced than during his work last year in the survey of civilization. He is developing into a creditable student.

The purpose of the plan of electing the members of the honor society of the University High School was to increase the influence of the honor society in the life of the school. The faculty sought to place the election of the members above suspicion on the part of pupils and parents. The fact that intellectual interests are now given equal weight with course marks and the rating of the pupils' classmates on citizenship is given equal weight with the rating of the

faculty on citizenship absolves the members of the society from the charges of "mark-seeking" and "favor-currying" previously made.

In an earlier article[1] Charles J. Pieper presented data gathered from the faculty and pupils of the University High School regarding the qualities and traits which were considered in rating pupils on citizenship. His findings are shown in Table II. They indicate the need for a common understanding of the essential qualities of desirable citizenship on the part of faculty and pupils.

TABLE II*

MOST FREQUENTLY MENTIONED QUALITIES OF GOOD CITIZENSHIP AS RANKED BY FACULTY AND PUPILS

Quality	Rank by Faculty	Rank by Pupils
Co-operation	1	1
Honesty	2	4
Active participation in school activities	3	8
Responsibility	4	7
Consideration of others and their views	4	17
Sincerity	6	13
Courtesy	6	11
Industry	8	4
Scholarship	9	13
High ideals of duty	10	17
Seriousness of purpose	10	13
Loyalty to school	10	2
Wholesome attitude toward work	13	23
Ability to gain good will of others	14	9
Reaction to criticism	15	21
Efficiency in tasks and activities	16	†
Intellectual interests	16	†
Initiative and originality	18	11
Courage to defend one's self	18	25
Common sense	18	23
Leadership	21	2
Deportment	21	†
Character	23	19
Modesty	24	21
Energy	25	6
Good sportsmanship	†	16
Fairness	†	10
Popularity	26	26
Athletic ability	†	20
Offices held	27	26

* Charles J. Pieper, *op. cit.*, p. 163.
† Not listed.

[1] Charles J. Pieper, "Selecting Students for the Honor Society at the University of Chicago High School," *Extra-curricular Activities*, pp. 157–64. Twenty-fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Co., 1926.

During the school year 1926–27 the findings of the study by Pieper received considerable attention by both faculty and pupils. One assembly period was devoted to a discussion by the principal of the qualities of the desirable school citizen, and the points of agreement and disagreement between faculty and pupils were considered. As a result, the rating in 1926–27 was undertaken with keen interest on the part of the entire school.

Subsequently, correlations were computed to determine the degree of agreement between the citizenship ratings of the faculty and the citizenship ratings of the pupils. Composite scores were derived

TABLE III

CORRELATION BETWEEN THE CITIZENSHIP RATINGS OF JUNIORS AND SENIORS IN THE UNIVERSITY HIGH SCHOOL BY THE FACULTY AND THE CITIZENSHIP RATINGS BY THEIR CLASSMATES

Group	Number of Pupils	Correlation
Senior boys	58	.716
Senior girls	59	.615
Senior class	117	.664
Junior boys	49	.724
Junior girls	54	.581
Junior class	103	.664
All boys	107	.729
All girls	113	.640
Entire group	220	.685

for the ratings of the faculty and for the ratings of the pupils by obtaining weighted sums of the percentages of high, medium, and low ratings. The composite scores ranged from 290 to 110. The two groups of scores were each divided into ten divisions, and the nine correlations given in Table III were derived. The correlations were computed by means of the Holzinger statistical tables, use being made of logarithms, the slide rule, and arithmetical computation in cases of doubt. Three persons[1] checked the results for errors.

The correlations derived show a sufficiently high degree of reliability of judgment on the part of the pupils to indicate that their judgment is well worth obtaining and taking into consideration in

[1] The computations were made by H. H. Ryan, Ann Arbor, Michigan; Ralph Rodefer, Marquette, Michigan; and Leslie Bourn, Harvard, Illinois.

the discharge of an administrative responsibility which means much personally to the pupils in the upper grades of the secondary school. If honor societies are maintained in the secondary schools, the methods of selecting the members should be refined to a degree that will command the confidence of those who fail of election as well as of those who are elected.

The method now in use in the University High School is designed to eliminate two of the inherent weaknesses of the methods generally employed in schools having chapters of the National Honor Society, namely, the premium placed on working for marks and the incentive to curry favor with members of the faculty. A pupil can exercise creative desires in the fields of intellectual interests without jeopardizing his opportunities for scholastic recognition, and it is not necessary for a pupil to advertise his civic virtues before the faculty if the votes of his classmates have equal weight with those of the faculty in appraising civic worth. Furthermore, the improved method of recognizing scholastic and civic worth exercises a wholesome effect on pupil morale and gives to the members of the honor society a prestige and influence in the school in keeping with the purposes of the National Honor Society.

EARLY PUPIL PUBLICATIONS IN THE HIGH SCHOOLS OF CONNECTICUT

SILAS HERTZLER
Goshen College, Goshen, Indiana

The complete list of pupil publications in the high schools of Connecticut before 1875 includes eleven different names. The Hartford Public High School had four different papers during these years. They were the *Excelsior*, the *Rivulet*, the *Effort*, and the *High School Chanticleer*. The *Bud of Genius*, or *High School Offering*, was published by the New Britain High School. The *Scholar's Experiment*, the *Experiment*, and the *Aurora* were published in Middletown. The *Souvenir* came from the Waterbury High School, and the *School Bell* from Bridgeport. Reference is found to the *Satchel* as coming from the Litchfield High School.

In 1853 the editor of the *Waterbury American* spoke of having received the *Satchel* from the Litchfield High School, saying that the productions therein were all original. These productions were selected from the composition exercises of the pupils. The *Satchel* was reported as being "quite a neat and spicy affair."[1] This paper came from a private academy, however, rather than from a public high school. In 1854 the editor of the *Connecticut Common School Journal* mentioned that he had received a number of high-school papers. Without giving the name of the paper, he said that one was from the Litchfield Academy.[2] This reference is undoubtedly to the same publication reported in the *Waterbury American* the previous year. No public high school existed in Litchfield until about 1881.[3]

Of several of these papers, the names only have been recorded; no copies are available for study. The editors of the *Connecticut Common School Journal* took an interest in the high-school journals of the time and tried to encourage such publications. In March,

[1] *Waterbury American* (Waterbury, Connecticut), August 12, 1853, p. 2.

[2] *Connecticut Common School Journal*, IX (March 1854), 112.

[3] *Catalogue, Litchfield High School, Litchfield, Connecticut, 1907*, p. 16.

1854, the editor of this journal mentioned having received copies of the *Souvenir* from the Waterbury High School, copies of the *Experiment* from the Middletown City High School, and copies of the *Bud of Genius* from the New Britain High School. The editor said that these papers were "highly creditable to their editors and contributors."[1]

In 1860 the editor of the same educational journal reported that he had received "a very neat little paper, called the *School Bell*, from the pupils of the Bridgeport High School." He says of the paper, "May the tones of this bell always be as pure and clear as they have been thus far. It ought to be a very strong bell."[2] No other data have been found concerning the *Souvenir* from Waterbury or the *School Bell* from Bridgeport. While at intervals from as early as 1827 a high school was reported in Bridgeport, no permanent high school was established there until 1876.[3]

The papers called the *Scholar's Experiment* and the *Experiment*, from the Middletown City High School, doubtless were the same publication. There are two references to the fact that such a paper existed; however, no copy has been located. The reference in the *Connecticut Common School Journal* of March, 1854, where it was called the *Experiment*, has already been given. In the catalogue of the Middletown City High School for 1850–51, the paper is called the *Scholar's Experiment*. The paper is described as a "little sheet sustained entirely by the students." It was published monthly. The purpose was to interest pupils "in writing original essays, and by seeing their productions in print, to correct their errors, and to stimulate them to more care in preparing their compositions, than they otherwise would bestow upon them."[4] This paper began at least as early as 1850 and continued at intervals until 1854 or later.

The early publications of the high-school pupils of the state now available for study are the *Excelsior*, the *Effort*, and the *High School Chanticleer* of the Hartford Public High School; the *Bud of Genius*,

[1] *Connecticut Common School Journal*, IX (March, 1854), 112.

[2] *Ibid.*, XV (October, 1860), 319.

[3] *Rules and Regulations of the Board of Education, Bridgeport, Connecticut, 1876*, p. 23. *Rules and Regulations of the Board of Education, Bridgeport, Connecticut, 1877*, p. 18.

[4] *Catalogue, Middletown City High School, Middletown, Connecticut, 1850–51*, p. 13.

or *High School Offering*, of the New Britain High School; and the *Aurora* of the Middletown City High School. The first high-school pupil publication in the state was the *Excelsior*, published by the boys of the Hartford Public High School beginning May 9, 1848. It was a four-page journal. Each page measures 9½ by 11½ inches and contains three columns. It was published every two months. Two different issues are now available. The issue for May 9, 1848,[1] is on file in the state library in Hartford. Volume I, No. 2, for July, 1848,[2] is on file in the Yale University Library. The editors were chosen from the student body. The paper sold for two cents a copy. The published journal grew out of two written papers, which had existed in the high school for some months previous to May, 1848. These two papers were the *Rivulet*, edited by the girls, and the *Excelsior*, edited by the boys. There is no record that the *Rivulet* was published, although articles were published in each of the known issues of the *Excelsior* seemingly taken from the manuscript editions of the *Rivulet*. A serious effort was made to have a good paper, and the results are indeed commendable.

The first edition of the *Excelsior* contains a series of most interesting articles. The first is a poem entitled, "A Parody on Excelsior," taken from the *Rivulet*. This is followed by an original article of three chapters on "The Author's First and Last Trial of the Pleasures of Sporting." Page 2 contains three brief editorials under the heading, "Editorial Conversations." On page 3 are two short humorous articles entitled, "Foreign Correspondence"; "A Story," containing puns on the names of some of the high-school pupils, from the *Rivulet;* a short poem in a combination of Latin and English words; and a humorous proclamation by Joshua D. Giddings, the principal of the high school, concerning the vacation which was soon due. Page 4 begins with "The Poet's Corner." This section contains two poems and a few proverbs. Then comes an article, headed as "Chapter I" of "The Book of the Chronicles," on how the high school was built. The last column is devoted to further humorous statements.

[1] *Excelsior* (Hartford Public High School, Hartford, Connecticut), I (May 9, 1848) 1–4.

[2] *Ibid.* (July, 1848), 1–4.

The July issue of the *Excelsior* followed the same general plan as the earlier issue but with numerous minor variations. Some of the more substantial articles are entitled, "Mystery," "Who Has Lived Long Enough?" "The Dream," "Hints on Shade Trees," and "Books." There is an "original" poem and a poem entitled, "Bells," signed "Tintinnabulum." The latter poem was taken from the *Rivulet*, as was also the "Essay on Mind." In addition, there are humorous items and conundrums. Everything in the paper is original. The main editorial is in the form of a poem. The editors also make brief comments on other school papers received as exchanges. Mention is made of one exchange called the *F of L*, "conducted by the girls of this school." This seems to mean that the *F of L* was a paper published by the girls of the Hartford Public High School although the school was not definitely named.

In an authoritative study on the *Origin and Development of the High School in New England before 1865*,[1] Professor E. D. Grizzell includes a photograph of the title page of the *Effort*, a student paper from the Hartford Public High School, and a brief description of this paper. The first issue of this paper was published in October, 1851. It was a paper of twelve single-column pages, intended to represent pupil talent only. It made no effort to be humorous. Professor Grizzell describes the articles as essays, poetry, chronicles, sketches, and stories.

The *Bud of Genius*, or *High School Offering*, from the New Britain High School, made its first appearance January 2, 1854. It was published by the pupils of the high school. There were six student editors—two boys and four girls. There were sixteen additional contributing editors. This publication, like the *Excelsior*, was a four-page paper with three columns to a page. The first article, written in the form of a reverie, gives a few of the historical facts in the development of the New Britain High School, beginning with its opening, May 15, 1850. Most of the articles in this venture in high-school journalism are brief. Many are signed with the first names of the writers. Of these articles, more were written by girls than by boys. In the main editorial, concerning the object of the paper, it

[1] Emit Duncan Grizzell, *Origin and Development of the High School in New England before 1865*, pp. 347–49. New York: Macmillan Co., 1923.

is stated that the publication was to be the spokesman for the Alpha and Delta societies of the high school. The published articles were selected as representative of the composition work of the members of the two societies. There is a humorous poem on "The Toad," and there are a few humorous turns in some of the prose compositions. In the main, however, there is a serious and elevated tone running through the paper. A descriptive statement divides the city schools into primary school, intermediate school, grammar school, and high school.[1]

The *High School Chanticleer*[2] of the Hartford Public High School was the third attempt of that school in the field of high-school journalism. The first issue was printed in January, 1857. It, too, was a four-page paper, with three columns to a page. This paper, more than any other student publication of the state, had running through it a humorous vein. No editor was named, but the title page stated that the *High School Chanticleer* was "published every once in a while by Jim Crow Chanticleer." The contents were made up of poems, humorous articles, correspondence, and jokes. As stated in the main editorial, the purpose of the paper was to devote itself to "agriculture, horticulture, trigonometry, geometry, hieroglyphics, acoustics, politics, the lost arts, the weather, general intelligence, poetry, chronology, phrenology, osteology, lithology, and everything else worthy of our attention."

The *Aurora*,[3] published for the first time at the Middletown City High School in November, 1875, was an eight-page pupil magazine of a somewhat different type in that it was edited and managed exclusively by the Senior class.

Some of the first articles did not differ greatly from those in the high-school journals previously described. The titles are: "A Just Reward," "Fall Leaves," "That's Nothing to Me," "Fashion," "Tale of a Possum," and "Lake Pocotopoque." Page 3 describes the curriculum and names the departments and teachers of the high

[1] *Bud of Genius* (New Britain High School, New Britain, Connecticut), January 2, 1854, p. 2.

[2] *High School Chanticleer* (Hartford Public High School, Hartford, Connecticut), I (January, 1857), 1–4.

[3] *Aurora* (Middletown City High School, Middletown, Connecticut), I (November, 1875), 1–8.

school in an article entitled, "What Is Done in the Central School." The editorials appear on page 5, where the statement is made that "the *Aurora* is the first literary production of the Senior class of the Middletown High School that has appeared in print before the public." The three editorials are on "School Items," "Personal Intelligence," and "Character."

Two unique features were introduced in this paper. First, no previous pupil paper in the state had given any specific attention to the alumni of the high school. On pages 3 and 4 of the *Aurora* the "Alumni Record" of the Middletown City High School is given in detail. Second, pages 6–8 are devoted to advertisements. While the advertising contributes nothing to the value of the otherwise excellent paper, it may have been a necessary means of financing the publication.

CHECKING AND CONTROLLING HIGH-SCHOOL ABSENCES

HARRISON H. VAN COTT
Supervisor of Junior High Schools, New York State Department of Education

While principal of the Schenectady High School, the writer found a need for a plan of checking and controlling absences which would satisfy the following objectives: (1) to encourage more regular attendance on the part of all pupils; (2) to encourage the boys and girls to tell the truth about absences; (3) to increase the efficiency in checking attendance in classes; (4) to place the responsibility for granting excuses on the best teacher excuse monitors; (5) to relieve a majority of the home-room teachers from checking and honoring excuses, work which was not painstakingly done by many of them; (6) to raise the percentage of attendance for the whole school; (7) to encourage promptness; (8) to penalize indifferent, lawless pupils for inexcusable absences; and (9) to be fair concerning all absences, giving the pupils the benefit of the doubt and making ample allowances for absences caused by any misfortune.

The Schenectady Senior High School enrols all tenth-, eleventh-, and twelfth-grade public-school pupils in the city. Approximately eleven hundred eleventh- and twelfth-grade pupils attend school from 8:15 A.M. to 12:30 P.M., and one thousand tenth-grade pupils are in attendance from 12:50 to 5:00 P.M. Each session is organized on the home-room basis, the pupils reporting to their home rooms before and after each session. Each session is divided into five class periods. The physical-training classes for the tenth-grade pupils are held in the morning and those for the eleventh- and twelfth-grade pupils in the afternoon.

Until the plan here described was put into operation, each home-room teacher was responsible for receiving parents' excuses from his pupils, for approving or disapproving them, for issuing passes to classes which were either the approved excuses themselves or yellow unexcused absence slips obtained at the principal's office, for con-

ferring with classroom teachers concerning absences, etc. In order that this responsibility might be assumed completely and administered efficiently, it was given to a few teachers. These monitors had proved themselves worthy of the task by virtue of their past work. Only a few home-room teachers had considered the checking and controlling of attendance of prime importance.

Four home-room teachers were chosen to be excuse monitors for the pupils of the morning session and three for the pupils attending during the afternoon. Each excuse monitor was responsible for receiving the excuses of from 250 to 400 pupils in about ten home rooms. The pupils registered in these home rooms knew that their excuses would be handled by the one excuse monitor, who was scheduled to receive in a definite room excuses from the pupils of her assigned home rooms during the fifteen minutes before the time for the tardy bell for home-room assembly.

After the ringing of the tardy bell, excuses were received by the assistant principals for the morning and afternoon sessions, respectively. The excuse monitors themselves were relieved after the tardy bell rang because they had to meet their respective classes. There was an allowance of five minutes for the checking of attendance and the preparation by the home-room teacher of home-room absentee lists, which were sent to the office for the preparation of the daily absentee lists. These absentee lists showed the name of each pupil absent and the number of the home room to which he belonged.

In order that the seven excuse monitors and the assistant principals might work uniformly and in harmony, the duties, directions, rules, and objectives were mimeographed in the form of a bulletin and copies distributed to the excuse monitors. Copies of the bulletin were also posted in the home rooms for the pupils' information.

Bulletin for Excuse Monitors

DUTIES

1. Issue all excuses for absence from regular school classes for all pupils in your respective groups of home rooms. (*a*) A pupil should present a written excuse from his parent or guardian to his excuse monitor before the tardy bell rings for school assembly. (*b*) Excuse monitors should file parents' excuses and issue properly punched excuse cards for them, using their best judgment as to whether excuses with or without penalty should be granted.

2. File all written parents' excuses in box file and keep them at least one year in your possession. Then file them with Mr. Wemple[1] for at least two years, after which excuses may be destroyed.

3. Collect all excuse cards from home rooms, where they should be left by the pupils after complete use has been made of them, and file them for convenient use and reference.

4. At the end of each month prepare a list of names of pupils with penalized absences on a form provided by the office and give to Miss McCarthy, the office secretary, for use in making the monthly attendance report.

5. At the end of each term prepare a list of names of pupils penalized for absence, indicating required passing marks for pupils' subjects. Penalties for excessive tardiness will be added. Three cases of unexcused tardiness are to be counted as one unexcused absence. These lists should be handed to Miss McCarthy for posting.

DIRECTIONS

1. Grant excuse cards through the week as required. Place written excuses with the home-room number written plainly on each on your spindle for one week. If pupil fails to bring an excuse, card should be granted as usual, but monitor should give a study-hall[2] retention slip for one period. If he fails to present an excuse the second day, he must be sent to the office. Send all truants to the office and also those pupils who have an excessive number of absences for an interview with the principal.

2. Each Monday morning collect the excuse cards of the previous week from the home rooms in your group.

3. Monday afternoon, before sorting and filing the used excuse cards, see whether Miss Hoskins and Mr. Spaine,[3] who grant excuses to all late comers, have any excuses which belong to the pupils of your group.

4. First sort the written excuses by home rooms and then check them with the returned cards. If any cards are missing, keep those excuses in a definite place with a label on, "Cards Not In." Then send notes to the respective home-room teachers giving names of pupils and dates of absence of the missing cards. Next alphabetize by surnames the excuses of those pupils whose cards you have and file them in your box file.

5. The day before the list of penalized pupils is due at the office a list should

[1] Mr. Wemple was the janitor of the school, who filed the excuses in the box file on shelves in the storeroom, where they were preserved during the school life of the pupils.

[2] The study hall was used as a make-up and study room and also as the place for making up unexcused tardinesses and absences.

[3] Miss Hoskins and Mr. Spaine were assistants who granted excuses to pupils arriving after the tardy bell rang. They were stationed near the only unlocked entrance to the building. All entrances were provided with fire bolts and could be locked from the outside.

be sent to each home room to give the pupils an opportunity to have their cards rechecked if they think there has been an error.

RULES

1. Every unexcused absence will be penalized by having the required passing mark for the term raised one point in every subject missed because of the absence.[1]

2. Five absences will be permitted per term without penalty if, in the estimation of the monitor, the excuses are acceptable.

3. A period of three or more consecutive days lost from a class or classes should count as one absence if a physician's certificate or personal statement by parent is presented.

4. Each day's absence from a class or classes not covered by a physician's excuse should count as one absence and, after the limit of five allowable absences is reached, should raise the passing mark one point. Absence from five odd periods should count as one day. Absence just before or after a vacation counts double.

5. Pupils suspected of abusing the privilege of the nurse's excuse should be investigated individually by the excuse monitor through Mrs. Brockett, the school nurse, and, if suspected rightly, should be penalized. Any absence means work lost, and the nurse's excuses should be counted toward the allowable five per term for those periods covered.

6. In granting your excuses, be uniform in your procedure from week to week. Gain the pupils' confidence. Grant "worthy excuse" when, in your best judgment, it is deserved.

7. Absence from gymnasium classes should be excused without the penalty of make-up if the pupil has been absent because of illness for at least three days. All other gymnasium absences must be made up.

8. In preparing the list for Miss McCarthy as referred to in Duty 4, include the names of all pupils who have been issued cards during the month on account of the following reasons: T., W.S., or S.F. for more than three days. These lists should give the names of the pupils, the dates of their absences, and the reasons for absences.

OBJECTIVES

1. Be fair with pupils. Remember the Golden Rule. When you doubt their word, check it. If your doubt is well founded, penalize.

2. Urge pupils to tell the truth. There may be many worthy reasons for absences, and, if truthful excuses are considered worthy in the monitor's best judgment, penalties should not be imposed.

[1] This rule was approved by the board of education on the ground that regular attendance benefits pupils and irregular, inexcusable absences on the part of lawless pupils are a primary cause of failure in school work and necessarily call for repeated teaching service and a consequent waste of public money.

To administer the plan each excuse monitor was provided with the following materials: (1) the bulletin of duties, directions, rules, and objectives; (2) a supply of excuse cards, a sample of which is shown below; pink excuse cards were used for absences from physical-training classes; (3) a punch bearing the initial letter of

H.R. A.M. **EXCUSE CARD** H.R. 107 P.M.
Per. I ____ Schenectady High School Per. I FW
Per. II ____ Per. II AEB
Per. III ____ Per. III MEN
Per. IV ____ Per. IV LP
H Per. V LHI Per. V ACE

NOTE.—This card will, when properly filled out and signed by the excuse monitor, readmit the pupil when issued in exchange for a written excuse from the parent. It should be presented to all teachers of classes and home room for signatures and then filed with the home-room teacher at the end of the session. Home-room teacher should return this card to excuse monitor.

John Jones (Name) was absent from his scheduled school appointments on the following dates and is hereby readmitted with
H without penalty. The reason for absence was: JH, SF, IW, DF, Q, T, S, WS, WE

H H

Sept. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31
Oct. Nov. Dec. Jan. Feb. Mar. April May June

H

the excuse monitor's surname; (4) a box file for parents' excuses; (5) a card file for keeping records of the absences of pupils from their respective home rooms; and (6) a spindle file.

The excuse card itself played an important part in the plan because it told the story of the pupil's absence to the home-room teacher and classroom teachers in sufficient detail to enable them to keep their attendance and class registers accurately and in accord with the records of the excuse monitor.

The excuse card reproduced above is a used card showing the

home-room teacher and class teachers of John Jones that on November 19 he was absent from the fifth morning period, from Home Room 107 in the afternoon, and from Periods I, II, III, IV, and V in the afternoon; that the parent's excuse contained a reason for the absence which was considered a worthy excuse (WE)[1] by Miss Hoskins, the excuse monitor; and that the readmission carried no penalty. The card indicates that all the teachers of John Jones have seen and signed it with their initials opposite their respective periods. The excuse monitor has approved the excuse by punching the initial letter of her surname in five distinct places.

Because of the regular weekly collection of the excuse cards from the home rooms and the carefully kept record of absences as they occur, the compilation of the list referred to in Duty 5 is not burdensome. From such a posted list pupils can ascertain before taking their examinations what their required passing averages must be.

The following results of using this plan for controlling absence were noted.

1. The responsibility for judging excuses was placed on a few teachers who had excelled in such work and was discharged fairly and effectively.

2. Lawless pupils were properly penalized for absence. This had a wholesome effect on them because they were the ones who were affected most by an increased passing mark.

3. Poor attendance greatly affects class work. Class work counted 75 per cent toward promotion. This fact was sensed by pupils who were absent frequently, and their records of attendance improved.

4. The excuse cards definitely determined for the home-room teachers the reasons for absences to be recorded in the registers, and this assisted them in their work. No arguments followed over the reasons given for absences because the parents' excuses were filed by the excuse monitors.

5. Because the pupils were thoroughly informed concerning the plan before it was put into operation and because they were made

[1] JH = Jewish holiday; SF = sickness in family; IW = inclement weather; DF = death in family; Q = quarantine; T = truant; S = sickness; WS = withdrawn on account of suspension; WE = worthy excuse; H = initial letter of excuse monitor's name punched with special punch.

to feel that a truthful excuse would be honored more than an untruthful but acceptable excuse, the plan was thought fair and just by the pupils themselves. A pupil penalized on account of unexcused absences very seldom complained to his excuse monitor.

6. Pupils were encouraged by the plan itself to give truthful reasons for absences.

7. All pupils watched their absences closely and became more punctual and regular in attendance.

8. The plan has been in operation for four years. The first month after the plan was put into effect the percentage of attendance averaged approximately 96 whereas formerly it had averaged from 88 to 90. Since the first month and up to December, 1927, the percentage of attendance has averaged approximately 95. The high-school percentage of attendance for many months has been higher than the percentage of attendance in the elementary and junior high schools.

No plan would yield perfect results. The absences of some pupils probably would not be remedied by any plan of checking their excuses. The principal, excuse monitors, and teachers all have a part to play in convincing such pupils that they should desire to attend school regularly for their own welfare. This is the attitude every high-school pupil should have, and it is the duty of school officers to help him acquire it.

HIGH-SCHOOL PUBLICATIONS

C. M. LOCKMAN
Fort Scott High School, Fort Scott, Kansas

This article deals with high-school publications and presents some facts gathered recently when the writer sent questionnaires to eighty-seven high schools in cities of the first and second classes in Kansas. Schools in cities of these classes were selected in gathering the data because it was thought that a greater number of these schools would have publications. Of the eighty-seven schools to which questionnaires were sent, seventy-two, or 83 per cent, replied.

Three types of high-school publications will be considered: the school paper, the annual (yearbook), and the handbook.

THE SCHOOL PAPER

Fifty-five of the seventy-two schools publish school papers. Forty-eight of these schools have classes in journalism, and five have advanced courses. Since the paper in each of these schools is a project in the class in journalism, it is evident that there is considerable interest in newspaper work in the schools and that the institutions are endeavoring to issue publications that conform to newspaper standards.

The school paper is issued bi-weekly in thirty-four schools, every week in eighteen schools, once a month in two schools, and every three weeks in one school. In seven cities the school furnishes material for a page in the local paper once a week.

The subscription price varies a great deal throughout the state. At Coffeyville, the board of education is paying for the paper this semester, and each pupil is given one copy free of charge. Another school publishes a monthly paper and charges fifteen cents for it. Eleven schools charge fifty cents; ten schools, seventy-five cents; and twenty-seven schools, $1.00; one school charges $1.50.

The percentage of pupils subscribing ranges from 25 to 100. The median is 51. The subscription price seems to have little effect on the percentage of pupils subscribing; that is, the percentage is about

the same in schools where the subscription price is $1.00 as in schools where the subscription price is fifty or seventy-five cents.

Forty-five papers are self-supporting; five get aid from the board of education; and five get aid from other sources. In only ten cases is the paper printed in the school shop. The number of papers printed, the size of the papers, and the cost of printing vary to such an extent that one would need to discuss the papers individually in order to give information about these items.

In the majority of the schools the papers are limited to the publication of school news. In twenty cases school organizations pay for display advertisements. The majority of the papers carry local advertising.

THE ANNUAL OR YEARBOOK

Forty-three of the seventy-two high schools publish yearbooks. The Senior class edits the yearbook in thirty-six schools. In many cases the staff does not depend on local advertising to help defray the expense of the book. The yearbooks of only twenty-five of the forty-three schools carry local advertising. In a great many instances the proceeds from the Senior play go into the yearbook fund. Two schools get appropriations from the board of education. Eight additional schools, however, stated that the board of education would make up any deficit. In twenty cases the Senior class and the general activity fund make up all deficits. In practically every case where the yearbook shows a profit the money is either placed in a reserve fund for the next yearbook or spent by the Senior class for a memorial.

Of the first-class cities that replied, Atchison is the only one that does not publish a yearbook. Leavenworth and Parsons are not included in the report, however, because they did not return the questionnaire.

The reports show that the cost of the yearbooks and the number of pupils buying them are in proportion to the enrolments of the schools.

Very decisive answers were made by many of the principals to the question "Do you believe the annual is worth the cost of time and money that it requires?" The vote stands twenty-three to eight against the annual; some were in doubt and did not reply to the

question. There seems to be very little effort, however, to discontinue the publication.

A few schools are using an issue of the school paper as a pictorial account of the year. Concordia and a few others have magazines that are bound into volumes at the end of the year. The majority of the replies indicate that this plan would not meet with the approval of the pupils but would perhaps be favored by a majority of the faculty.

Like the school paper, very few yearbooks are printed in the school printshop. Only five schools depend on their own shops. Other schools have tried printing their yearbooks but have discontinued it because the work is too difficult for high-school pupils.

The feeling is almost unanimous that there is a tendency to publish a book that will rank high in a contest rather than to arrange one that will fit the demands of the school. Engraving companies are accused of emphasizing the contest side too much. Seventy per cent of the schools enter their yearbooks in one or more contests.

THE HANDBOOK

Very little information was obtained with regard to handbooks. Good specimens of this type of publication were received from Lawrence, Kansas City, Salina, Winfield, Pittsburg, and Topeka. These booklets contain valuable information and should be of great assistance to teachers and pupils because they serve as the official school directory in all schedules, courses, activities, and matters of routine.

SUMMARY

The data obtained indicate that there is much interest in school publications in the high schools of Kansas. In practically every case they are being paid for without the aid of the board of education. The school paper is issued for publicity purposes, but only 51 per cent of the pupils are subscribers. The high-school principals believe that the yearbook is not worth its cost in time and money; yet they say there is very little effort in the direction of discontinuing it. No satisfactory substitute seems to have been found.

THE EVEN-FRONT SYSTEM VERSUS THE ROTATION SYSTEM IN LABORATORY PHYSICS

H. W. DUEL
West High School, Minneapolis, Minnesota

A number of investigations have recently been made with regard to the relative merits of the lecture-demonstration method and the laboratory method of instruction in science. Cooprider[1] and Johnson[2] compared these methods with classes in biology; Cunningham,[3] with classes in botany; Anibal,[4] Knox,[5] Nash and Phillips,[6] and Wiley,[7] with classes in chemistry; and Phillips[8] and Kiebler and Woody,[9] with classes in physics.

[1] J. L. Cooprider, "Oral versus Written Instruction and Demonstration versus Individual Work in High School Science," *School Science and Mathematics*, XXII (December, 1922), 838–44.

[2] Palmer Oliver Johnson, "A Comparison of the Lecture-Demonstration, Individual Laboratory Experimentation, and Group Laboratory Experimentation Methods of Teaching High-School Biology." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Minnesota, 1926.

[3] Harry A. Cunningham, "Individual Laboratory Work versus Lecture Demonstration," *Proceedings of the High School Conference of November 18, 19, and 20, 1920*, pp. 104–7. University of Illinois Bulletin, Vol. XVII, No. 14. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois, 1921.

[4] Fred G. Anibal, "Comparative Effectiveness of the Lecture-Demonstration and Individual Laboratory Method," *Journal of Educational Research*, XIII (May, 1926), 355–65.

[5] W. W. Knox, "The Demonstration Method versus the Laboratory Method of Teaching High-School Chemistry," *School Review*, XXXV (May, 1927), 376–86.

[6] H. B. Nash and M. J. W. Phillips, "A Study of the Relative Value of Three Methods of Teaching High-School Chemistry," *Journal of Educational Research*, XV (May, 1927), 371–79.

[7] William H. Wiley, "An Experimental Study of Methods in Teaching High School Chemistry," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, IX (April, 1918), 181–98.

[8] Thomas D. Phillips, "A Study of Notebook and Laboratory Work as an Effective Aid in Science Teaching," *School Review*, XXVIII (June, 1920), 451–53.

[9] E. W. Kiebler and Clifford Woody, "The Individual Laboratory versus the Demonstration Method of Teaching Physics," *Journal of Educational Research*, VII (January, 1923), 50–58.

In general, the results of these studies indicate that, so far as imparting information to the pupils is concerned, the lecture-demonstration method is superior to the laboratory method of procedure in immediate results, but retention of subject matter, as shown by delayed tests, is better accomplished by the laboratory method. The difference between the methods, however, is not great in either case.

So far as can be ascertained, the laboratory method used in all these investigations was the even-front system, no account being taken of the rotation system. In order to establish conclusive evidence of the relative merits of the lecture-demonstration and laboratory methods, the investigator must take into account not only one laboratory method but every laboratory method. If it can be shown that the rotation system is superior to the even-front system, very little has been proved, and the question of the relative merits of the lecture-demonstration and laboratory methods is still undecided.

The study here reported is an attempt to determine under ordinary school conditions the relative merits of the even-front system and the rotation system in laboratory physics. The comparison is made in three ways: (1) with respect to the acquisition of essential knowledge, (2) with respect to the time required, and (3) with respect to the cost of the equipment.

The two systems may be defined as follows: The even-front system is a laboratory system in which all the members of a class are performing the same exercise at the same time. Ordinarily, pupils are not allowed to start a new exercise in advance of the other members of the class. When a certain percentage[1] of the class has finished an exercise, the entire class starts a new one. Those who have not finished the first exercise must do so either outside of class or after performing the second exercise. To obviate the duplication of laboratory equipment so far as possible, it is customary to have pupils work in groups, an individual pupil remaining in the same group throughout the course.

Under the rotation system a number of different exercises are being performed at the same time, a limited number[2] of pupils being

[1] In the initial experiment in the study here reported the percentage was 67; in the second experiment, 75.

[2] This number depends on the individual instructor. In the study here reported the two systems were kept identical with respect to group size so far as practicable.

assigned to each set of apparatus. When a pupil has finished an exercise, he takes it to the instructor for correction and acceptance. Immediately on the acceptance of one exercise he is assigned another. A pupil is not required to remain in any group but may perform as many exercises as his ability and industry will permit.

For most exercises a set of apparatus is required for each group if the even-front system is used; in the rotation system each exercise requires only one or two sets of apparatus. Thus, a class containing eight groups, as was the case in the study here reported, would ordinarily require eight sets of apparatus for each exercise if the even-front system is used; only one or two sets of apparatus would be needed for each exercise if the rotation system is employed.

The study was made in the West High School, Minneapolis, during the school year 1925–26. The enrolment in the school is approximately 1,800, and the conditions are typical of those in large city high schools. The subjects of the investigation were 168 pupils in second-term physics. The subject matter used was a laboratory course in magnetism and electricity consisting of eighteen exercises.

Two experiments were made. In the initial experiment, which was conducted during the first semester, sixty pupils were used. In the second experiment, carried on during the second semester, 108 pupils were used. In both studies the pupils were divided into four laboratory divisions of approximately equal size. Two of the divisions used the even-front system, and the other two used the rotation system. In the initial experiment the pupils worked in groups of two because the classes were small. In the second experiment there were four pupils in a group on account of the larger classes. In both experiments there were a few pupils in each class who were not included in the comparison because of differences in mental ability and difficulties encountered in arranging programs. The time allotted in both the initial experiment and the second experiment was twenty laboratory periods of one hour each, covering a period of ten weeks.

The method of procedure in both experiments was as follows:

1. The recitation work, which was the same in all classes, preceded the laboratory work.

2. The pupils in the two groups were paired according to their

intelligence quotients, which were determined by the Miller Mental Ability Test, Form A.

3. An objective test of 130 questions was formulated and given at the beginning of the experiment. This test included questions on information, problem-solving, and other reasoning. It was designed

TABLE I

MEAN SCORES IN PERCENTAGE OF POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENT OF PUPILS USING THE EVEN-FRONT AND ROTATION SYSTEMS IN THE INITIAL AND SECOND EXPERIMENTS*

EXPERIMENT	EVEN-FRONT SYSTEM		ROTATION SYSTEM		$M_r - M_{ef}$
	Mean Score $\frac{1}{2}(M_{ef})$	S.D.	Mean Score (M_r)	S.D.	
Initial	52.8	13.5	59.6	12.8	6.8 ± 2.3
Second	53.1	14.8	60.3	14.0	7.2 ± 1.8

* Percentage of advantage of rotation system in the initial experiment $= \frac{(59.6 - 52.8)}{52.8} = 12.9$. Percentage of advantage of rotation system in the second experiment $= \frac{(60.3 - 53.1)}{53.1} = 13.6$.

TABLE II

MEAN NUMBER OF EXERCISES COMPLETED BY PUPILS USING THE EVEN-FRONT AND ROTATION SYSTEMS IN THE INITIAL AND SECOND EXPERIMENTS*

EXPERIMENT	EVEN-FRONT SYSTEM		ROTATION SYSTEM		$N_r - N_{ef}$
	Mean Number of Exercises per Pupil (N_{ef})	Range in Number of Exercises	Mean Number of Exercises per Pupil (N_r)	Range in Number of Exercises	
Initial	13.90	13–14	15.57	10–18	1.67
Second	13.93	12–14	16.17	13–18	2.24

* Percentage of advantage of rotation system in initial experiment $= \frac{1.67}{13.9} = 12.0$. Percentage of advantage of rotation system in second experiment $= \frac{2.24}{13.93} = 16.1$.

especially to test laboratory achievement in magnetism and electricity.

4. At the end of the experiment the same test was given again. From the scores on this test and those obtained in the first test the amount of improvement was determined. The results obtained in both experiments are shown in Tables I and II.

5. At the end of the second experiment three additional tests were given in order to check the results obtained with the objective

test described. These tests were as follows: The first, designated as the Glenn-Osbourn test, consisted of sixty-five questions—twenty multiple-choice questions and forty-five true-false questions. It was a combination of Tests 13B, 15B, and 16B devised by Glenn and Osbourn.[1] The second test contained forty-two questions of the completion type and was composed of the Hurd Test X, Part I Alpha and Part II Alpha.[2] The third test was the Iowa Physics Test, Series C, Form 1,[3] devised by Camp. The results obtained with these tests are shown in Table III.

TABLE III

MEAN SCORES MADE BY PUPILS USING THE EVEN-FRONT AND ROTATION SYSTEMS IN THE GLENN-OSBOURN, HURD, AND CAMP TESTS IN THE SECOND EXPERIMENT

TEST	EVEN-FRONT SYSTEM		ROTATION SYSTEM		$S_r - S_{ef}$
	Mean Score (S_{ef})	S.D.	Mean Score (S_r)	S.D.	
Glenn-Osbourn*	41.31	6.59	42.83	5.14	1.52± .76
Hurd†	25.56	7.30	26.72	5.66	1.16± .84
Camp‡	45.73	20.18	61.83	20.51	16.10±2.62

* Highest possible score, 65.
† Highest possible score, 42.
‡ Highest possible score, 100.

Table I shows an advantage in favor of the rotation system in mean percentage made of possible improvement of 6.8±2.3 in the initial experiment and of 7.2±1.8 in the second experiment. According to Odell,[4] these differences may be considered reliable, since in the initial experiment the difference is approximately three times the probable error, and in the second experiment the difference is four times the probable error.

The initial and second experiments may be considered as a single experiment. The combined results show a difference in mean per-

[1] Earl R. Glenn and E. L. Osbourn, New Types of High-School Physics Tests for Investigational and Instructional Purposes. New York: Earl R. Glenn and E. L. Osbourn (425 West 123d Street), 1923.

[2] Archer W. Hurd, Physics Test (unpublished). Minneapolis, Minnesota: University High School, University of Minnesota, 1926.

[3] Harold L. Camp, Iowa Physics Tests. Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Co., 1926.

[4] C. W. Odell, *Educational Statistics*, p. 227. New York: Century Co., 1925.

centage made of possible improvement of 7.0±1.4 in favor of the rotation system. This difference shows a high degree of reliability, being five times the probable error. According to McCall,[1] there is more than a practical certainty that a real difference exists.

It is interesting to note that the advantages in improvement for the rotation system of 12.9 per cent in the initial experiment and of 13.6 per cent in the second experiment correspond quite closely to the advantages of 12.0 per cent and 16.1 per cent for the same system in the number of exercises completed. This may indicate that, if the pupils using the even-front system had not been required, by the very nature of the system, to wait until the majority of the class had completed an exercise before starting another exercise, they too might have shown as much improvement as do the pupils using the rotation system. In other words, it tends to show that the retardation of a class by the slower pupils caused a considerable waste of the pupils' time; 11 per cent of the pupils' time was wasted in the initial experiment and 14 per cent in the second experiment.[2] Herein lies one great advantage of the rotation system: It puts a premium on industry. The even-front system, on the other hand, affords very little opportunity to the industrious pupil. In fact, the even-front system often provides an incentive for loafing.

Table II shows that the average time required for the completion of a given number of exercises (for example, the first fourteen exercises) was 12.0 per cent greater with the even-front system than with the rotation system in the initial experiment and 16.1 per cent greater in the second experiment. Although these percentages are only approximations as some exercises required more time than did others and all the pupils did not do the same exercises, they indicate that a considerable amount of time can be saved by the use of the rotation system. The time thus saved might be utilized in the recitation work, or, as in this study, it might be used for the performance of additional exercises.

No record was kept of the actual amount of time spent in taking care of the apparatus required for the even-front and rotation sys-

[1] William A. McCall, *How To Measure in Education*, p. 406. New York: Macmillan Co., 1922.

[2] These percentages were computed on the basis of twenty hours, which was the time allotted in both the initial experiment and the second experiment.

tems. However, it seems evident that, if eight sets of apparatus are required for an exercise with the even-front system and only two sets are required with the rotation system, the use of the rotation system means a saving of a considerable amount of the instructor's time. It is difficult for anyone who has not been a physics instructor to realize the amount of time required for the proper care of physics apparatus. Many pieces of apparatus deteriorate and become useless because the instructor does not have sufficient time to keep them in repair. The use of the rotation system might not only furnish a solution of this problem but also enable the instructor to improve his instruction in other ways. It might, for example, enable him to give more class demonstrations, to formulate objective tests, to introduce new subject matter of special interest, and otherwise to improve the quality of his teaching.

All the results in Table III show an advantage for the rotation system. While the results from the Glenn-Osbourn and Hurd tests show only small differences between the two groups, this may be due to the fact that these tests cover textbook work as well as laboratory work and were not designed to test laboratory achievement only, as was the objective test designed especially to measure laboratory achievement in magnetism and electricity. However, the Camp test, a standardized device, shows a decided advantage in favor of the rotation system, the difference in the mean scores of the even-front and rotation groups being 16.10 ± 2.62. The reliability of this difference is very high, the difference being more than six times the probable error.

It might be well to consider the significance of the differences shown in Tables I and III. By comparing these differences with the probable errors, we find that the chances of real differences are as follows:[1]

Difference between mean percentages of possible improvement in the initial experiment—21 to 1.

Difference between mean percentages of possible improvement in the second experiment—142 to 1.

Difference between mean percentages of possible improvement in the initial and second experiments considered as a single experiment—1,340 to 1.

[1] Harold O. Rugg, *Statistical Methods Applied to Education*, p. 391. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1917.

Difference between mean scores in the Glenn-Osbourn test—4.5 to 1.
Difference between mean scores in the Hurd test—1.8 to 1.
Difference between mean scores in the Camp test—19,230 to 1.

It is evident that there are reliable differences in four of these cases, two of the differences being very decided. While the reliability of the other two differences is low, it is significant that in every instance the advantage is in favor of the rotation system.

The writer has prepared an estimate showing in detail the comparative cost of all apparatus and material required by the even-front and rotation systems for the performance of the eighteen exercises used in the experiment. In order to make the comparison an equitable one, the cost was computed on a ten-year basis, as with ordinary care most of the apparatus would last for ten or more years. Space will not permit the inclusion of this table in the present article, but the estimate shows that, with respect to the cost of apparatus and material, the even-front system is nearly twice as expensive as is the rotation system.

SUMMARY

On the basis of the foregoing data, the following conclusions seem justified.

1. The rotation system yields better results than does the even-front system in imparting essential knowledge.

2. The use of the rotation system means a saving in the purchase of the extra apparatus and material necessary for the even-front system.

3. The rotation system is more economical of laboratory time than is the even-front system and thus permits the performance of more exercises or the use of more time in recitation.

4. The rotation system is to be preferred because it saves much of the time usually devoted to the care of apparatus. The time thus saved can be used by the instructor in improving the quality of his teaching.

5. The rotation system puts a premium on industry, while the even-front system offers very little incentive and opportunity to the industrious pupil.

WHERE DOES HE RANK?

EDGAR M. FINCK
Dover Township Public Schools, Toms River, New Jersey

When John Jones applies for admission to college, one of the items of information which his high-school principal is asked to furnish concerning him is his "rank in the graduating class." "What is his percentile rank?" "In which third of the class does he rank?" "In which fifth of the class does he rank?" Practically every eastern college asks for this information in one form or another.

Ranks are sought as an aid in selecting entrants from long lists of candidates. Scholastic marks of various schools are not comparable. Entrance committees say, "If we know where a candidate stands among his fellows, we have a rough basis for comparison between candidates from different schools as well as added light on the individual candidate. Of course, the best tenth and the poorest tenth proclaim themselves plainly. We need help with the middle group."

The conscientious principal strives to be fair to his school and to his pupils. Does John Jones rank in the second or third fourth, in the third or fourth fifth? Can he guess at John's absolute rank? The principal's problem is complicated by the fact that one college asks for the pupil's rank based on the work of the last year; another college asks for the pupil's rank based on the work of the last two years; a third college does not specify any basis. Should the rank be affected by athletic ability or other extra-curriculum activities or by attitude in the school? Should it involve the I.Q? Should it be a strictly scholastic rating?

In the experience of the writer the number of colleges and normal schools demanding ranks and the number of high-school graduates striving for admission to higher institutions have increased to the point where it is farcical not to face the facts squarely. High-school graduates are being accepted or rejected, to some extent at least,

on the basis of rank. Three major questions present themselves: (1) Do all secondary-school principals rank the graduates of their schools on the same basis? (2) Does the basis on which the pupils are ranked make any difference in the rank of the individual pupil? (3) Is there any one basis of ranking which is more equitable than the others?

ARE HIGH-SCHOOL GRADUATES RANKED ON A UNIFORM BASIS?

In December, 1927, a questionnaire was addressed to the principals of the 152 approved public high schools and the 67 approved private and parochial secondary schools in New Jersey. One hundred and forty-one, or 93 per cent, of the public-school principals replied. Only two large high schools are not represented. Thirty-six, or 54 per cent, of the private schools responded, including all the larger preparatory schools. In all, there are answers from 177, or 81 per cent, of the approved secondary schools in the state. Any facts that may be disclosed would not be radically changed by replies from the remaining schools. The questionnaire was of the multiple-answer type. It simply stated that high-school principals are continually being called upon to rank the graduates of their schools, suggested seven possible bases of ranking, and requested that the list be checked or added to. The results are shown in Table I.

Of the entire group of principals, only one confesses, or asserts, that he simply guesses at a pupil's rank. One principal strikes a sympathetic chord in saying, "Occasionally, if the questions come at inconvenient times, we guess, but usually our method is to compute averages of the last year." Another principal writes, "We do not 'rank' pupils. This is a progressive school, and we send the college our opinion of the pupil's ability to do college work irrespective of other pupils." Is an "opinion" a guess or not?

Not a single school ranks pupils solely on the basis of their intelligence quotients. However, thirteen schools use the I.Q. in combination with other data. One private school uses the I.Q. and the work of the last four years, "also character-analysis blanks and general attitude." Just how these factors are combined is not explained. The reliability of the I.Q. in prophesying scholastic success will be shown in the following section.

The most common basis for ranking pupils is the average of all marks for scholastic work above Grade VIII regardless of whether the work was completed in three, four, five, or six years. Sixty-eight, or 38 per cent, of the schools use this method. It is noteworthy that only two private schools are included in the list.

TABLE I

BASES ON WHICH GRADUATES OF NEW JERSEY SECONDARY SCHOOLS ARE RANKED

Basis of Ranking	Public Schools		Private Schools		Total	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
A careful guess	1	0.7	0	0.0	1	0.6
I.Q.	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Scholastic average for all work above Grade VIII	66	46.8	2	5.6	68	38.4
Scholastic average for all work above Grade IX	7	5.0	0	0.0	7	3.9
Scholastic average for all work of last four years	28	19.9	9	25.0	37	20.9
Scholastic average for all work of last three years	5	3.5	0	0.0	5	2.8
Scholastic average for all work of last two years	2	1.4	2	5.6	4	2.3
Scholastic average for all work of last year	5	3.5	12	33.3	17	9.6
Other bases	27	19.2	11	30.5	38	21.5
Total	141	100.0	36	100.0	177	100.0

The classification covering all work above Grade IX was included primarily because of the three-year senior high schools. Three of the seven schools using this plan are in that class.

The work of the last four years is the same as all work above Grade VIII except for the few pupils who fail to complete the work in the customary four years. Thirty-seven schools have adopted this basis.

The work of the last three years was also intended to apply to three-year senior high schools, differentiating between those pupils who complete the work in the regulation three years and those who require longer. Three of the five schools using this basis are senior high schools. A fourth is one of the largest four-year high schools, the principal of which says, "The first year we consider an adjustment year."

Two small public schools, a parochial school, and a large preparatory school use the work of the last two years as a basis. In addition, three schools say that they plan to change to this basis this year. In this connection, William A. Wetzel, principal of the Trenton Senior High School, writes, "The reason why we intend to include the records of the last two years in determining the relative ranks of graduates is that these ranks are now so significant with reference to college entrance that we should have data covering a wider period than the last year. The reason why we do not go back of the Junior year is that practically any work that would be continued in college is sure to be done in either the Junior or the Senior year. The Sophomore year is a sort of preparatory year to these two. The real worth of the college preparation of a pupil lies in the work done in the last two years in the high school." Eli Pickwick, principal of the East Side High School, Newark, who now bases his rankings on the work of the last four years, says, "I find that many pupils do not strike their stride in the early years. I think, therefore, that a rank based on the last two years of work would give a fairer estimate of pupil power at college, and from now on I shall adopt that basis."

The work of the last year serves as a basis for ranking pupils in seventeen schools, seven of them being large preparatory schools. In fact, preparatory schools prefer this basis to all others. One preparatory-school principal says, "We have many pupils who have completed two or three years in other schools before they come to us. It has seemed more equitable to us to make final decision on the basis of the last year only, although previous records are considered in arriving at the final judgment." Several schools say that they "weight" or "give special consideration to" the work of the last year.

Thirty-eight schools use methods not easily classified. Some of these methods are unique. One principal reports, "We use the average of eighth-year work unqualified; we multiply the average of tenth-year work by 2, of eleventh-year work by 3, of twelfth-year work by 4. The grand total then constitutes the pupil's score." This is an elaborate effort to give increasing weight to the work of the later years. Another principal says, "We give the pupil's rank and

the number of pupils in the class for each of the last four years. If he has repeated a year, we indicate the fact." Other plans, too involved to be reproduced here, attempt to give credit according to the number of prepared recitations a week.

New Jersey schools now use twenty-seven distinct bases for determining the ranks of their graduates. Newark has four large public high schools, all of which have different ranking systems. We have a clear-cut answer to the first question for the state of New Jersey. The high-school graduates are ranked on diverse bases.

DOES THE BASIS OF RANKING AFFECT THE STANDING OF THE INDIVIDUAL PUPIL?

A definite answer to the second question has been secured by actually ranking the thirty-three graduates of the Toms River High School in June, 1927, in each of the ways suggested by the questionnaire. The various rankings are shown in Table II. The pupils were not ranked on the "guess" basis because the other rankings had been completed before this method was suggested. It was then no longer possible to make an unbiased "guess." Two facts should be kept in mind in considering these data: The class is small. It is only one class. There is no reason, however, to believe that it is not a typical class, and the writer at least is convinced that the larger the number of cases, the greater the discrepancies in rank.

Table II shows that the I.Q.[1] fails miserably as an index to scholastic accomplishment. Pupils 22 and 23, who fail to rise above the third fourth on any other basis, are in the first fourth in I.Q. Pupils 6 and 7, who are in the first fourth on any other basis, are in the third fourth on the basis of I.Q. Pupil 1, who ranks either first or second on any scholastic basis, ranks sixteenth in I.Q. It is evident that any ranking which involves the I.Q. and scholastic marks is highly unreliable. Particularly is this true since there is no accurate method of combining the two factors.

The effect of the various rankings may further be observed in

[1] The I.Q.'s of the pupils were determined by the use of the Dearborn Group Intelligence Tests, Series II, General Examinations C and D. With a few exceptions, there were available also for each pupil the I.Q. as determined by the Otis Self-Administering Test of Mental Ability and the I.Q. as determined by the Terman Group Test of Mental Ability.

TABLE II*

Thirty-three Graduates of the Toms River High School Ranked on Seven Bases

I.Q. (1)	All Work above Grade VIII (2)	All Work above Grade IX (3)	All Work of Last Four Years (4)	All Work of Last Three Years (5)	All Work of Last Two Years (6)	All Work of Last Year (7)
			First Quarter			
11	1	1	1	1	2	1
23	2	2	2	2	1	2
24	3	3	3	3	3	3
3	4	7	4	4	4	4
22	5	6	6	7	5	5
2	6	4	7	6	7	7
4	7	9	9	9	8	8
10	8	8	8	8	6	6
			Second Quarter			
14	9	12	10	5	9	32
15	10	11	11	12	16	12
16	11	13	5	10	19	16
26	12	5	12	13	11	11
12	13	20	13	11	14	25
33	14	10	14	20	20	9
5	15	14	15	14	21	13
1	16	21	16	21	10	24
			Third Quarter			
6	17	19	17	18	32	14
9	18	17	18	17	26	10
19	19	15	19	15	12	18
29	20	22	20	24	13	23
30	21	23	21	22	24	20
7	22	24	22	23	15	19
13	23	18	23	16	22	21
20	24	26	24	19	23	17
			Fourth Quarter			
28	25	16	26	25	18	15
32	26	30	25	29	17	22
18	27	25	29	30	29	28
27	28	27	30	26	33	26
17	29	29	27	27	28	33
25	30	32	31	32	30	31
8	31	33	32	33	27	30
31	32	28	28	28	25	29
21	33	31	33	31	31	27

* This table is to be read as follows: Pupil 11 ranks first on the basis of I.Q.; Pupil 2 ranks first on the basis of the work of the last two years; Pupil 1 ranks first on all other bases.

the record of Pupil 24, for example. This pupil is to be found in the first, second, and third fourths. The same is true of Pupils 9 and 10. Pupil 22 appears in the first, third, and fourth fourths. Pupils 15, 16, 21, 26, and 32 are in the second, third, and fourth fourths.

Since few principals consider the I.Q. in ranking, it may be disregarded and only the six scholastic rankings considered. It is apparent that membership in the first fourth is fairly constant as the basis of ranking shifts. In three instances Pupil 5 drops into the

TABLE III

CORRELATION BETWEEN THE SEVERAL RANKINGS OF THIRTY-THREE PUPILS AS SHOWN IN TABLE II

	I.Q.	All Work above Grade VIII	All Work above Grade IX	All Work of Last Four Years	All Work of Last Three Years	All Work of Last Two Years
All work above Grade VIII	.35	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
All work above Grade IX	.31	.95	.....	.....	.....	.....
All work of last four years	.36	.99	.95	.....	.....	.....
All work of last three years	.30	.96	.97	.96	.....	.....
All work of last two years	.36	.86	.81	.86	.83	.....
All work of last year	.28	.82	.78	.80	.84	.83

second fourth, but the remaining seven pupils maintain their places in the first fourth. In the fourth fourth, likewise, six of the nine pupils—Nos. 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, and 33—are uniformly found. In the second fourth, however, only Pupil 11 is unaffected; in the third fourth, only Pupil 23. The other fourteen pupils near the middle of the group fluctuate one or more fourths. This is the critical middle group that has been referred to. Where do these pupils really rank? Pupil 32 is thirty-second in Column 2 and ninth in Column 7, a difference of 23 places!

If Column 1 is disregarded, the first fourth shows nine different individuals; the second fourth, fifteen; and the third fourth, sixteen. Membership in the fourth fourth would be fatal to many a pupil's chances. Surely not more than the allotted nine should be jeopardized by position there. Yet Table II shows fourteen cases. If Column 1 is included, there are sixteen possibilities for the nine places. Which pupils really belong in the lowest fourth?

Table III shows the correlation between the various rankings

as determined by the Pearson product-moment formula.[1] As might be expected, any correlation which involves the I.Q. is low. The other correlations range from high to unusually high. Thus, the correlation between the ranking on the basis of all work above Grade VIII and the ranking on the basis of all work of the last four years is .99. This is due to the fact that in this particular group almost all the pupils completed the work above Grade VIII in four years, making the two rankings almost identical.

It is clear that the basis of ranking affects the rank of the individual. His rank is an important factor in determining whether the gates of a college swing open for him easily, with difficulty, or not at all. His rank may vary through three fourths of his class, depending on the method of ranking in use in the particular school.

IS ANY ONE METHOD OF RANKING MORE EQUITABLE THAN THE OTHERS?

In the search for the fairest basis of ranking pupils, the I.Q. must be dropped at once. It has been shown to be unreliable. The fact that a pupil has a high I.Q. is no index to the field in which he will exercise his intelligence. In any event, all credential blanks provide a space for the I.Q. State it, and let it speak for itself.

Such factors as "attitude around the school" and "general ability" may be discarded also. These considerations merely make the judgment highly subjective and inaccurate. Again, the credential blank always provides space for "remarks," where any non-scholastic merit may be noted. If, in order to award local honors, such an inclusive basis is demanded, rank the few eligible pupils on this basis, but let this be a record for local consumption. As a matter of official, private record, select some one basis of scholastic achievement and use it accurately for all pupils.

Which of the six possible bases is the most equitable? To permit comparison between schools, the basis should be as nearly uniform as possible. The steady increase in the number of junior-senior high schools would limit the basis of ranking to the work of the last three years at the most. Again, the first year of a four-year high school has long been recognized as a period of readjustment. Should the

[1] For the method employed, see Henry E. Garrett, *Statistics in Psychology and Education*, pp. 190–91. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1926.

basis of ranking, then, be the work of the last three years, of the last two years, or of the last year? The evidence is not great, but it all seems to point in one direction.

In order to deal with the matter statistically, the sum of the ranks of each pupil by the three methods now under consideration has been computed. Thus, Pupil 1 ranks 1, 2, and 1, giving a composite rank of 4; Pupil 2 ranks 2, 1, and 2, giving a composite rank of 5. The entire group was re-ranked on the basis of these composite ranks. Finally, the correlation between this composite ranking and each of its components was computed. The results are as follows: composite rank and rank based on all work of the last three years, .92; composite rank and rank based on all work of the last two years, .95; composite rank and rank based on all work of the last year, .93. All the correlations are high, but the highest is that which involves the work of the last two years. Admittedly, this is scant evidence, but it is the best available.

Opinions are more plentiful. Against the work of the last three years it has been said that the first year in the senior high school is also to a degree a period of adjustment. The longer the period included as a basis, the greater the chance that pupils will change schools during that time. The longer the period, the greater the labor of computing ranks. Against the last year only it has been urged that the subjects studied in a single year are not sufficiently comprehensive to serve as a basis of ranking. A brief illness would have an undue effect on the pupil's rank. The hope of a diploma, of parental reward, or of a college scholarship or the desire to "get in" may produce a short spurt of endeavor which is not a fair index of the pupil's usual work. The last year is often a fifth year in which part or all of the work is being repeated, resulting in a rank unduly high.[1]

The only disadvantages of basing ranks on the work of the last

[1] Pupil 32 is an unusual athlete but a weak student. He failed to graduate with his class. Nevertheless, he was offered "all expenses" at a certain college if he could "get in." Returning to high school for a final year, he was ineligible to compete in athletics and concentrated all his energies on four subjects, all of which he was repeating. This resulted in a rank on the basis of the work of the last year which was abnormally high for him. He is in college, but the writer's "guess" is that he will not finish if he even gets into the Sophomore year.

two years are that the work of computing ranks would be greater than in the case of ranks based on the work of the last year only and that changes in enrolment are more likely to occur in two years than in one. All things considered, the work of the last two years is the most desirable basis.

The foregoing data are not as complete as might be desired. It would be enlightening to have a similar study of a much larger group and to follow the pupils into higher institutions, where their success or failure would serve as a check on our theories. In the meantime, the facts at hand justify, in the writer's opinion, a change from the "all-work-above-Grade-VIII" basis, which he has been using.

Until further evidence is available, each permanent record card in the Toms River High School will bear this statement: "This pupil ranks _____ among _____ graduates ranked on the basis of the scholastic work of the last two years." It will then be possible by inspection to place a pupil in the proper half, third, fourth, fifth, or thirteenth of his class as any college may request. It will not be possible to rank him on the basis of the last year's work or on any other basis. This fact will be frankly stated when necessary. College-entrance committees will be reasonable when they know that a sincere effort is being made to furnish accurate information. Perhaps it is not too much to hope that associations of colleges and secondary schools will adopt a uniform basis of ranking pupils.

HONOR ROLLS AS AN AID TO SCHOLARSHIP

CHESTER W. HOLMES
Morgan Junior High School, Holyoke, Massachusetts

Until intelligence tests and achievement tests have supplanted teachers' marks, the latter must be used to determine in large measure the success or failure of pupils in reaching the standards set by school authorities. The use made of their marks by the pupils themselves is often significant. If they pay little or no attention to them, taking them lightly or for granted, an unwholesome and negligent attitude is fostered or allowed to develop.

In the Morgan Junior High School, Holyoke, Massachusetts, an effort has been made to cause the teachers' marks to have a stimulating effect on the pupils—to get them to try to raise their general averages by working harder each successive quarter of the school year. The following plan has been adopted. The pupils are rated on the common numerical scale of 100. Those whose averages in four major subjects, such as English, Latin, algebra, and general science, are 90 per cent or higher have their names placed on the first honor roll; those whose averages are between 85 and 89 have their names placed on the second honor roll; and those whose averages are between 80 and 84 have their names placed on the third honor roll.

At the auditorium exercises following the close of each ten-week period, which constitutes a quarter of the year's work, the names of these pupils are read. Those on the first honor roll come to the stage; those on the second and third honor rolls stand at their seats. Their names are also published in the local daily paper. Children are like adults; they like to see their names in the paper, and so do their parents; and the pupils know that they have to work to get good marks.

The purpose in publicly reading and printing the pupils' names is to reward those who have worked hard to keep up their scholarship averages and to stimulate to greater effort those whose averages are near the percentages required. It is in one sense similar

to the public awarding of athletic insignia to pupils who have represented the school honorably on the athletic field.

The honor roll is conceived not as a scientific measuring instrument of pupil ability but solely as a device to improve the pupils' scholarship through appeal to their competitive spirit, that competitive spirit which manifests itself in the desire on the part of many pupils to excel scholastically rather than athletically or musically. Far too often have the efforts of pupils to stand high in their studies been held up to ridicule as something unworthy of so-called "red-blooded" boys and girls. By the recognition, through the honor roll, of this natural impulse on the part of pupils to excel in the particular field in which they feel themselves competent to take part, all tendency to ridicule has been removed. The announcement of the honors each quarter is awaited with the keenest interest and anticipation.

The following extract from a theme written by one of the Junior III girls after the marks for the first quarter had been issued and had shown that her class had not measured up to the previous Junior III class indicates how some of the pupils feel when the honor roll is published.

> "The mighty fall and the weak conquer!" That is what happened on November 16 when the quarterly report cards were issued. At least one would think so by the reading of the honor roll.
>
> Of the whole junior high school, only four pupils were on the first honor roll. . . . . There was a greater number on the second honor roll. Junior III was represented by seventeen pupils. Junior II had a poor showing with only seven pupils who had attained averages between 85 and 89. The third honor roll, as usual, had the greatest number of pupils. There were fifty-seven, which is a rather poor showing for so large a school.
>
> The total number of pupils on the honor roll was 24.1 per cent of the junior high school enrolment. This is lower than last year. Why can't we have a higher percentage? Don't be discouraged by these first marks. Try harder even if you have to spend extra hours on home work. Show your Morgan spirit, and let's have everybody on the honor roll 100 per cent strong!

Obviously this girl's exhortation to her classmates was impossible of fulfilment, but it shows her seriousness of purpose and her efforts to inspire her schoolmates to work more earnestly for the honor of the school.

It is proper to mention that the principal of the senior high school has stated that the general scholastic average of the senior high school, as shown by the honor roll, is rising, leading him to conclude that scholarship is beginning to be recognized as a rather respectable and desirable attribute. Yale students recently voted that a Phi Beta Kappa pin is more to be prized than an athletic "Y"; and President Lowell of Harvard, in his report for 1926–27, presents tables showing that the number of students seeking degrees with distinction has steadily increased yearly since 1922.

TABLE I

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF PUPILS ON THE HONOR ROLL BY QUARTERS FOR 1925–26 AND 1926–27 AND FOR THE FIRST TWO QUARTERS OF 1927–28

	1925–26				1926–27				1927–28	
	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II
Number of pupils on the honor roll	91	113	118	119	85	114	143	148	120	113
Number of pupils attending the school	338	342	330	318	353	334	333	322	345	343
Percentage of pupils on the honor roll	26.9	33.0	35.8	37.4	24.1	34.1	42.9	46.0	34.8	32.9
Gain in percentage over the preceding quarter	.....	6.1	2.8	1.6	.....	10.0	8.8	3.1	.....	−1.9

Table I shows the number of pupils on the honor roll by quarters for the years 1925–26 and 1926–27 and for the first and second quarters of the year 1927–28; the number of pupils attending the junior high school each time the honor roll was made up; the percentage of pupils on the honor roll by quarters; and the gain in percentage over each preceding quarter. It should be noted that the marks recorded for the second quarter were arrived at by averaging the marks for the first quarter with those for the second quarter and those for the midyear examinations. Because final examinations have been discontinued, the marks recorded for the fourth quarter include those for the third quarter and those for the fourth quarter.

Last year the school set as a goal toward which the pupils should work the standard represented by the slogan "Half the school on the honor roll by the close of the school year in June." This was considered as practically impossible of attainment, but it seemed

desirable to place before the pupils a definite and challenging objective. Table I shows that the school year closed with 46 per cent of the pupils on the honor roll, a record which indicates that most of the pupils must have tried hard to master their school work. That, after all, is what the school is trying to accomplish by maintaining an honor roll—to get the pupils to work faithfully to master their studies. All the class work is based on the supervised-study plan, and no home work is permitted in Junior I and Junior II except by request of the parents; home work is required in Junior III.

At the close of the second quarter of the school year 1927–28 the honor roll for the first time showed a loss in the number of pupils on it as compared with the number for the preceding quarter. Thus, two problems were presented: (1) What is the reason for the drop? (2) How can the situation which it indicates be remedied?

Educational Writings

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTES

Studies in citizenship.—Two investigations of value to persons interested in the social studies have recently been added to the series of publications comprising contributions to education made by students of Teachers College, Columbia University. The first book[1] purports to reveal what citizens know about the public schools. The second book[2] presents a list of the political, economic, and social problems which may find a place in courses in the social studies.

Todd's investigation surveys the information citizens have about the board of education, school finance, curriculum, school buildings, pupils, teachers, school organization, and the superintendent of schools. The inquiry was made primarily by means of a true-false test which the investigator submitted to more than seven thousand parents in seventeen cities in widely separated parts of the country. From the results of the test the author constructed a T-scale to measure and state in quantitative terms the information about public-school matters possessed by the citizens of one community as compared with that possessed by the citizens of other communities. Of the conclusions of the investigator, the following have special interest.

> On the whole, citizens know just about 50 per cent of what is most desirable, even necessary, for them to know about their schools to enable them to give reasonably intelligent consideration to public-school affairs. . . . . American mothers know no more about the public school than do the fathers. . . . . The real purpose, or function, of the junior high school—the idea of what it tries to do—has never "gotten across" to the American people. . . . . Citizens have little idea as to the number of children their community must educate, what the community is spending on education, the number of teachers required, minimum wage paid teachers in any department. They have little idea of their relative ability to support education [pp. 85–86].

The aim of Hockett's investigation was "to furnish those persons who deal with education for citizenship a list of the more important problems and issues of social, political, and economic life in contemporary America" (p. iii). To

[1] William Hall Todd, *What Citizens Know about Their Schools.* Teachers College Contributions to Education, No. 279. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1927. Pp. 86. $1.50.

[2] John A. Hockett, *A Determination of the Major Social Problems of American Life.* Teachers College Contributions to Education, No. 281. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1927. Pp. vi+102. $1.50.

achieve this aim, the author used two criteria: (1) a tabulation of the problems and issues treated in twenty-two books written by "frontier thinkers" and (2) a record of recent events in American life in selected periodicals. Of the books analyzed, the following are typical: Bryce's *Modern Democracies*, Croly's *Promise of American Life*, Hobhouse's *Elements of Social Justice*, Laski's *Grammar of Politics*, Robinson's *Mind in the Making*, and Weyl's *New Democracy*. The periodicals utilized were the *Literary Digest*, in which the news summaries were recorded, the *Outlook*, the *Independent*, the *New Republic*, and the *Nation*, in which data from the short news editorials were tabulated. The problems and issues thus revealed were classified under four headings: (1) government, (2) industry and business, (3) social relations, and (4) international relations.

The following are representative of the 396 problems and issues listed. "The problem of eliminating filibustering and useless factions, obstructive tactics, while preserving freedom of legitimate discussions" (p. 39) (government); "the problem of abolishing the inheritance of wealth, or limiting it so rigidly that no persons who are able may live without performing productive work" (p. 57) (industry and business); "the problem of controlling secret, oath-bound, masked organizations which foster racial, religious, and class strife and attempt to administer law and government" (p. 71) (social relations); "the problem of abolishing war and insuring world-peace" (p. 81) (international relations).

Both studies deserve examination by all educators concerned with training in citizenship. If the assumptions on which the monographs rest and the methods of research which have been followed are recognized as valid, the results attained represent contributions to the science of education. Many students of social science will, however, question both the procedures used and the conclusions reached. For example, many will dissent from Todd's conclusion that the ignorance of citizens concerning the name of the chairman of the board of education, the length of term of office of board members, the number of members comprising the board, and the legal power of the board to make capital-outlay expenditures constitutes "an impeachment against civics and citizenship as taught in the schools" (p. 58). True, as Todd says, "it is not impossible for the average citizen to know that the public-school affairs in his city are intrusted to a board of education consisting of five or seven members, as the case may be, elected at large, holding office for, say, three years, fiscally independent" (p. 59), but it does not follow that such information is essential to good citizenship. Indeed, as the author points out, "facts and figures change" (p. 86), and many of the facts called for in his test would have little or no value to adults if learned when the adults were boys and girls in school because such "facts and figures" would have changed by the time adulthood was attained.

A similar weakness appears in Hockett's study. Many current problems are ephemeral in character, and the issue of one year often ceases to be an issue in succeeding years. Many illustrations of such ephemeral questions during the last fifty or sixty years may be cited. Among them are the following: political reconstruction in the South after the Civil War, the adoption of a bimetallic

monetary standard, the liberation of Cuba from Spanish rule, the construction of an Isthmian canal, the popular election of senators, the adoption of a constitutional amendment authorizing Congress to levy an income tax, the establishment of the Federal Reserve System, the problem of the entrance of the United States into the World War, and the question of establishing an educational test for the admission of immigrants. Similar problems and issues, some of which have already been disposed of and others of which seem likely to prove purely temporary in character, are included in Hockett's list—for example, the extension of the suffrage to women (p. 43), the adoption of a federal budget system (p. 46), the granting of a bonus to veterans of the World War (p. 47), the disposition of Muscle Shoals (p. 51), the construction of a Great Lakes-St. Lawrence deep-sea waterway (p. 64), and the establishment of a federal department of education (p. 77). In fact, of the nine problems and issues listed on a single page (p. 85), it is doubtful whether half will remain problematic throughout the next decade.

The main issue raised by such studies as those of Todd and Hockett is the part which facts, information, and problems should have in a course of study in the social sciences. Are facts to be taught because the facts are important as facts or because they are interpretative in character? Should a course for secondary-school pupils consist in "a consideration of America's crucial problems"; if so, should such problems be ascertained by the procedure ably employed by Hockett? Or should such a course comprise a study of principles and laws which social scientists have discovered, utilizing as illustrative material for illustrative purposes the events, issues, and problems of the day? The question is, in short, whether the primary emphasis in a high-school course in social science should be placed on present-day problems, some of which at least will be more or less ephemeral in character, or whether, instead, a course for secondary-school pupils should be focused on fundamental, interpretative principles as applicable a decade hence as today.

HOWARD C. HILL

A series in social history.—Teachers and students of history throughout the United States will welcome a series of books dealing with American social history edited by Arthur M. Schlesinger and Dixon Ryan Fox. The series is called, "A History of American Life," a title more apt and descriptive than is usually found. Four of the proposed twelve volumes in the series—Volumes II, III, VI, and VIII—have been published. If these four volumes are truly indicative of the character of the entire series, it will constitute an outstanding contribution to the developing field of American social history.

The First Americans,[1] Volume II of the series, deals with the period between 1607 and 1690. The eighty-three years are presented as "a period of community

[1] Thomas Jefferson Wertenbaker, *The First Americans, 1607–1690*. A History of American Life, Volume II. New York: Macmillan Co., 1927. Pp. xx+358.

beginnings" and "of development" (p. xix). "Growth and change are traced in many phases; in the sphere of intellectual culture, perhaps some losses as well" (p. xix). The chapter titles—"A New World Makes New Men," "Land and Labor in the Tobacco Colonies," "The New England Town and Its People," "The Fall of the Wilderness Zion," "A Transplanted Church," "The Invisible World," "The Practice of Physic," "The Rule of Conduct," "Man's Treatment of Man," "The Beginnings of an Intellectual Life," "Planter and Puritan at Play," "Homes along the Highway," and "The Progress of a Century"—are indicative not only of the content of the book but also of the spirit in which it is written. The chapters on "The Invisible World," dealing with the witchcraft delusions, and "The Practice of Physic" are particularly good. The conclusion of the entire book is well summarized in the following statement. "The men of the seventeenth century did well the task which fate assigned them. . . . . Their arduous labors in conquering the wilderness, their hardships and sufferings, were not in vain, for they planted firmly on the northwestern shores of the Atlantic the standard of European civilization, and laid the broad foundations of nationality upon which future generations were to erect the mighty structure of the United States" (p. 316). Professor Wertenbaker's style is vivid and charming; one leaves his book with a keen sense of having read a fascinating story well told.

The third book of the series, *Provincial Society*,[1] treats of the years from 1690 to 1763. It is perhaps more clear cut in its organization than is the preceding book and possesses fully as much charm. The chapters of the book are "The Structure of Society, 1690–1700," "The Economic Basis, 1690–1713," "The Aristocrats, 1690–1713," "The Common Man, 1690–1713," "The Intellectual Outlook, 1690–1713," "The Life of the Spirit, 1690–1713," "New Blood, 1713–1745," "The Changing South, 1713–1745," "The Commercialization of the North, 1713–1745," "The Growth of a Colonial Culture, 1713–1745," and "The Mid-Century, 1745–1763." The keynote of the book may be found in the author's conclusion: "In the two generations which we have covered from 1690 to 1763, the growth of the colonies had been most extraordinary, the population increasing nearly seven fold. . . . . In most of the colonies . . . . there had developed not only a local public opinion but some glimpse of a larger common life and destiny. . . . . There was now a stability and immunity from danger almost as great as in the mother-country itself" (pp. 320–21).

Volume VI, *The Rise of the Common Man*,[2] deals with one of the most intrinsically interesting periods of our national development—1830 to 1850. During these years, as the editors tell us, "for the first time in history a people faced the problem—today ever with us—of whether the finer fruits of civiliza-

[1] James Truslow Adams, *Provincial Society, 1690–1763*. A History of American Life, Volume III. New York: Macmillan Co., 1927. Pp. xviii+374.

[2] Carl Russell Fish, *The Rise of the Common Man, 1830–1850*. A History of American Life, Volume VI. New York: Macmillan Co., 1927. Pp. xx+392.

tion can be democratized without being vulgarized" (p. xvii). "It was a motley company that crowded the stage in the thirties and forties: Henry Wadsworth Longfellow and P. T. Barnum, Andrew Jackson and Horace Mann, Cyrus H. McCormick and 'Father' Miller, ... William Lloyd Garrison and Bishop Hughes" (p. xviii). All these figures and many others appear in the pages of the book. Typical of its chapter titles are "Farm, Plantation, and Highway"; "Industry, Invention, and Trade"; "The Politicians"; "Education for the People"; and "The Balance Sheet."

The Emergence of Modern America[1] is the title of Volume VIII, dealing with the years from 1865 to 1878. In the swiftly moving narrative of dramatic and conflicting events and tendencies "the 'Coal-Oil Johnnies,' the swaggering gamblers of Wall Street, the railway and mining kings, picturesque but evanescent figures, are offset by the bold standard-bearers of new university ideals, the venturesome creators of a new American literature, and the pioneers of test tube and microscope" (p. xviii). It is assuredly an age of transformation. As the reader comes to the end of the book, he feels that "the United States of Lincoln and Lee has dissolved before his eyes and that he sees before him at last the main outlines of 'modern America' " (p. xix). The chapter titles are "The Darkest Days in the South (1865–1873)," "The Industrial Boom in the North (1865–1873)," "Urban Living and Routes of Travel," "The Taming of the West (1865–1873)," "The West at Work (1865–1873)," "The Revolt of the Farmer (1868–1874)," "The Moral Collapse in Government and Business (1865–1873)," "The Everyday Life of Americans," "The Broadening of American Culture," "The Deepening of American Culture," "Two Memorable Years: 1873 and 1876," "Humanitarian Striving," "Recovery in South and West (1873–1878)," and "Embattled Industry (1873–1878)."

It is hardly the function of this review to undertake a critical analysis of the merits and demerits of these books as the historian sees them. It is sufficient to say that they are written by authorities within the fields treated and are thoroughly documented. Moreover, each book contains an unusually complete "Critical Essay on Authorities," in which may be found bibliographies of value to the general reader and to the student. In this review, however, we are primarily concerned with the usability of the books in history classes at the high-school level. It seems to the reviewer that the books, or at least liberal sections of each of them, can help high-school history-teaching in two important ways. First, they can furnish adequate, well-presented historical data for use in the preparation of floor talks or term papers. In this respect they constitute reference works which, covering a relatively new phase of history as they do, cannot easily be duplicated. The chapter titles listed suggest the value of the books as reference readings. Second, because of their extensive use of concrete illustrative material and their vivid summarization of historical movements, the books can be of great value in arousing a genuine liking for history, which is a recog-

[1] Allan Nevins, *The Emergence of Modern America, 1865–1878*. A History of American Life, Volume VIII. New York: Macmillan Co., 1927. Pp. xx+446.

nized objective of high-school teaching. Passages from each of the books are well worth reading to the class; in addition, a large percentage of high-school pupils can find pleasurable and inspirational reading for themselves in the books when they are used as supplementary reading for the history course.

The format of the books is excellent; they are clearly printed and sturdily bound. The illustrations, which are numerous, are largely reproductions of historical prints or drawings and are described in such a way as to tell complete stories in themselves. The mechanical aspects of the books accentuate, as their contents prove, their usability and value in the progressive high-school library.

HOWARD E. WILSON

The improvement of high-school teaching through case analysis.—The reason for the barrenness of results from much of the teaching in high schools is that teachers do not realize or understand the difficulties which are encountered in classroom situations. They often meet their classroom problems in a perfunctory and routine manner without analyzing the difficulties met and definitely applying the principles which sound educational theory would direct. Theory and practice are often unrelated aspects of classroom procedure to many teachers. Their practice has been acquired either through imitation or through trial-and-error experimentation, and their theory was learned as lessons to recite to teachers of courses in education during the period of training. As a result, classroom procedure is frequently ineffective for want of intelligent analysis of the conditions involved, and the learning of the pupils thereby suffers both in quality and in quantity.

The author of *Problems in Classroom Method*[1] has attempted to provide assistance to classroom teachers in high schools by relating theory to practice in the study of teaching problems. The treatment is divided into two parts. Part I presents forty-one difficulties in classroom procedure which are studied as case problems. The case problems are definitely stated; the principles of education which apply are listed; the solutions which have been proposed by teachers who collaborated with the author are presented; and constructive criticisms of the proposed solutions are offered. In the manner indicated, the author deals with "Problems in the Presentation of Subject Matter," "Problems in Directing Pupils' Learning," "Problems in the Routine of Class Management," "Problems in Securing Pupils' Co-operation," "Problems Arising from Pupils' Personal Traits," and "Problems Arising from the Teacher's Personal Traits." The specific problems treated under these headings range in number from five to twelve. The purpose of the author is to help the teacher to analyze troublesome classroom situations into the specific difficulties involved and to work out solutions for each difficulty in accordance with educational principles which satisfy the conditions in the given classroom.

[1] Douglas Waples, *Problems in Classroom Method*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1927. Pp. xxii+610.

Part II contains a classified list of 424 typical difficulties which have confronted high-school teachers. The difficulties are followed by suggestions for their solution drawn from professional literature and from the contributions of teachers in actual service and in training. The second part of the book is to be used as a case book. For example, a given teacher may encounter difficulty in getting her pupils to begin work promptly. This is a problem in class management. By referring to Part II (pp. 371–72), the teacher will find specific difficulties in prompt application enumerated and brief discussions of the solutions which have been proposed. If further aid is required, the teacher can refer to Part I (pp. 148–50) for the type treatment of the difficulty and a critical discussion of solutions which have been tried.

With this book available, there is no longer any valid excuse for failure on the part of teachers in secondary schools to apply educational principles to classroom practice.

W. C. REAVIS

A study of the relative values of intensive and extensive reading.—During recent years reading has been made the subject of much varied and thorough investigation. Very little investigation, however, has concerned itself with the question of the supplementary-reading assignment. Nevertheless, the practice of assigning collateral reading at various levels of instruction is sufficiently common to make an investigation as to the value of such assignments of signal importance to teachers. A recent book[1] not only records the results of such an investigation but also suggests methods of experimentation and testing procedure which may be carried forward with profit by any competent teacher.

The author begins the book by indicating the objectives and values of reading, by calling attention to the importance of reading in the school, and by summarizing the conclusions reached by the experimental literature dealing with extensive and intensive reading. There is a preliminary discussion of techniques which may be followed by the teacher who wishes to investigate the merits of extensive and intensive reading in the daily classroom work. The main body of the book deals with the results of tests designed to measure the relative effectiveness of these two types of reading. The author has been very ingenious in constructing tests which measure this effectiveness in a multitude of ways—information gained, problem-solving ability, outlining, reproduction of ideas, and permanency of retention. The extensive-reading method proved superior to the intensive-reading method in all cases except in the measurement of the accuracy of information gained, no significant differences between the two methods being apparent in this case. The effects of rapid reading, slow reading, normal reading, and re-reading on the comprehension of the material read are also indicated. A chapter summarizing the conclusions reached throughout the

[1] Carter V. Good, *The Supplementary Reading Assignment*. Baltimore: Warwick & York, Inc., 1927. Pp. xiv+228.

book and suggesting their application concludes the book. An excellent summary follows each chapter.

The book initiates investigation concerning a heretofore untouched phase of reading. It will probably stimulate more educational workers to investigate the merits of the supplementary-reading assignment. All the investigations recorded were carried on in education or social-science classes; hence the application of the results to other subjects remains a question. The chief value of the book lies in the fact that it may give direction to the investigations of teachers who have the desire and opportunity to carry on scientific study of educational problems.

ALBERT GRANT

Research problems in homemaking.—The tangible aspects of homemaking have been recognized in the development of home economics, and considerable research covering the practical side of the subject is at hand, but there have been comparatively few studies which aid in the solving of problems of family organization and relationship. There is likewise meager material with regard to housing and the matter of financing the family; yet these problems are vital to all homemakers.

Homemaking as a Center for Research[1] interprets the spirit of a series of eight Wednesday conferences held at Teachers College, Columbia University. The aim of the conferences was to abandon old traditions or ideas and to attack the problem of homemaking from a number of angles. Invitations were sent not only to homemakers, specialists, and students of homemaking but also to leaders in such fields as have any connection with homemaking as a profession. Lectures by specialists were arranged in advance, and thought-provoking questionnaires were prepared and sent each week to about fifty homemakers in the hope that a large number of problems might be brought up for discussion at the conferences. An accumulation of data for statistical use was thought to be of secondary importance as compared with the discovery of problems encountered in homemaking. "This report is a journalistic account of an exploring expedition, and its purpose is to arouse curiosity, not to assemble in accurate array the existing knowledge on the subject. The task remains untouched for the scientist and the student who follow the trails" (p. 7). The subjects thus explored are "Scientific Management Applied to the Home," "Household Administration," "Adapting the House to the Changing Family," "Socializing the Home," "Financing the Home," "The Personnel of the Home," and "Education for Homemakers." Orientation comes within the scope of each subject discussed. Since men as well as homemakers whose college education had often been in fields remote from homemaking were invited to participate, it is not surprising to find the so-called "unorthodox approach" (p. 1).

[1] *Homemaking as a Center for Research:* Report of the Teachers College Conferences on Homemaking. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1927. Pp. x+122.

For purposes of orientation a large number of people, including the layman, will find the book interesting. Teachers of homemaking subjects will undoubtedly profit by a study of it, for, aside from offering stimulation, it lends encouragement to efforts to relate the work of the school to that of the home.

HAZEL SHULTZ

Academic training of high-school teachers.—Much of the literature on the preparation of teachers in secondary schools has dealt either with the mere quantitative aspect, namely, the number of years of training, or with the specific professional training in methods and psychology. There is but meager interest concerning the preparation in the subject matter which the teachers are actually going to teach. It is usually assumed that a general education or a random collection of courses will suffice for the teaching of any or all of the high-school subjects.

This illogical situation and many others of the same type involved in the training and placement of teachers are vividly set forth in two essays,[1] one prepared by Edward A. Fitzpatrick and the other by Percival W. Hutson. The authors made exhaustive studies of the practical conditions from various angles. The amount of training and the nature of the training were investigated. Comparisons are made of the courses offered by the secondary schools, those pursued by the teachers in training, and those later taught by them as teachers in secondary schools. The placement or misplacement of teachers is analyzed into its conditioning factors.

Each essay contains practical recommendations based on the facts as gathered and interpreted. Both authors make a strong plea for more intelligent guidance of students in content training and in professional preparation for their future teaching careers. As a proper qualification for more permanent tenure, they advocate adequate preparation through a system of correlated studies in cognate subjects or fields, aiming thereby to avert the inefficiencies of narrow specialization on the one hand and of no specialization on the other.

Besides many valuable practical suggestions, the book furnishes examples of scientific investigations carefully executed. In the range of data and in saneness in interpretation, the treatments are important contributions in the field of teacher-training and teacher placement.

I. HU

A study of the Constitution.—During the past few years there has gradually developed a tendency to stimulate a natural curiosity and interest in our fundamental institutions. An ominous rumbling of agitation against our institutions has come to a climax in the insistent demand throughout the country by both legislators and educators for a deeper understanding of the Constitution and appreciation for it.

It has remained for an eminent citizen and authority on fundamental law

[1] Edward A. Fitzpatrick and Percival W. Hutson, *The Scholarship of Teachers in Secondary Schools.* New York: Macmillan Co., 1927. Pp. x+110+xiv+208.

to present a new angle to the study of this great document.[1] Although there is probably no other citizen whose acquaintance with our institutions has been of a more practical nature, the book effects an intimate appreciation through the presentation of the colorful drama stressing how the Constitution came about. President Coolidge effectively states in the Foreword that, "while we cannot all be trained in the technicalities of the law, we should all have some idea of our fundamental institutions. We need to know their relationships to our daily life, the reasons for their existence, and the benefits we derive from them, and the necessity to ourselves for their perpetuation" (p. vii). This the author has made possible through his scholarly yet delightfully informal account of the early beginnings and developments of the drama of building a constitution for the newly united states. He has literally turned the eyes of America far back into the past that the great pageant, wherein a people without shedding a drop of blood calmly and deliberately abolished one government, substituted another, and erected it upon foundations which had hitherto proved enduring, may be seen.

The treatise is especially well organized. After following through the beginnings and preliminaries of the Constitution, the author effectively portrays the battle, crisis, and final curtain. Then follow the problems of ratification, the political philosophy and basic principles, and balance wheel of the Constitution. While the organization does not appear unique, it proves so because of the vast store of interesting detail which is woven into the thread of the account.

The book could be used in either the junior or the senior high school and would make a valuable addition to the supplementary library. It should prove invaluable to pupils who are studying the story of the launching of the national government, for the human story element, which should be a primary consideration in this phase of our nation's history, is presented in an appealing and graphic manner.

ROBERT B. WEAVER

CURRENT PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

GENERAL EDUCATIONAL METHOD, HISTORY, THEORY, AND PRACTICE

BENNETT, HENRY EASTMAN. *School Posture and Seating.* Boston: Ginn & Co., 1928. Pp. xii+324. $2.00.

BUTTERWORTH, JULIAN E. *The Parent-Teacher Association and Its Work.* New York: Macmillan Co., 1928. Pp. x+150.

CLARKE, CLARENCE L. *Tenure of Teachers in the Profession with Special Reference to Wisconsin.* Ann Arbor, Michigan: Alumni Press, University of Michigan, 1928. Pp. vi+144. $1.25.

[1] James M. Beck, *The Constitution of the United States, 1787–1927.* Edited for school use by Edwin L. Miller and C. C. Barnes. New York: George H. Doran & Co., 1927. Pp. x+208. $1.25.

Educational Supervision: A Report of Current Views, Investigations and Practices. First Yearbook of the National Conference on Educational Method. Edited by James Fleming Hosic. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1928. Pp. viii+270. $1.50.

FISHBACK, ELVIN H. *Character Education in the Junior High School.* Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1928. Pp. xiv+190. $1.24.

HARRIS, PICKENS E. *Changing Conceptions of School Discipline.* New York: Macmillan Co., 1928. Pp. xviii+384. $2.00.

HENDERSON, JOSEPH LINDSEY. *Materials and Methods in the Middle Grades.* Boston: Ginn & Co., 1928. Pp. xiv+376. $3.00.

LINDSAY, E. E. *Problems in School Administration.* New York: Macmillan Co., 1928. Pp. xxiv+544. $2.50.

MACLATCHY, JOSEPHINE H. *Attendance at Kindergarten and Progress in the Primary Grades.* Bureau of Educational Research Monograph No. 8. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1928. Pp. xvi+144. $1.25.

PAYNE, E. GEORGE. *Principles of Educational Sociology:* An Outline. New York: New York University Press Book Store, 1928. Pp. xii+170.

WEBER, JOSEPH J. *Picture Values in Education.* Chicago: Educational Screen, Inc., 1928. Pp. 156.

BOOKS PRIMARILY FOR HIGH-SCHOOL TEACHERS AND PUPILS

AREY, ALBERT L., BRYANT, FRANK L., CLENDENIN, WILLIAM W., and MORREY, WILLIAM T. *New Physiography for Beginners.* Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1927 (revised). Pp. viii+614. $2.36.

BARKER, JAMES L., and BALLIF, JOHN L., JR., *Les verbes français et quelques tableaux grammaticaux.* Chicago: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1928. Pp. 252.

BOLENIUS, EMMA MILLER. *Literature in the Junior High School,* Book Three. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1928. Pp. xiv+752. $1.56.

BRESLICH, ERNST R. *Senior Mathematics, Book I.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1928. Pp. xxii+336. $1.50.

BRUNDAGE, MILTON B., and LEIBERMAN, JACOB. *Basic Assignments in Chemistry.* New York: Globe Book Co., 1928. Pp. vi+60. $0.34.

BUNKER, FRANK F. *Hawaii and the Philippines.* Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1928. Pp. iv+208.

CAMPBELL, FAY. *Charts for Civics, Geography, Arithmetic and General Science.* Chicago: Wheeler Publishing Co., 1928. Pp. 96.

CLARK, WELFORD D. *An Illustrated Dictionary of Modern Musical Instruments with a Glossary of Musical Terms.* Chicago: Hall & McCreary Co., 1928. Pp. 48. $0.25.

Great Moments from Great Stories. Edited with notes and an introduction by Thomas L. Doyle. New York: Globe Book Co., 1928. Pp. xii+282. $1.00.

GREENBIE, MARJORIE B., and DAVIS, HELEN LAWRENCE. *Young America Travels Abroad.* New York: Frederick A. Stokes Co., 1928. Pp. 298. $2.00.

LEMERCIER, NÉPOMUCÈNE. *Christophe Colomb.* Edited with introduction, notes and vocabulary by Charles Grimm. New York: Century Co., 1928. Pp. xx+114. $0.90.

LIPSKY, ABRAM, and WEDECK, HARRY E. *Nārrātiōnēs Biblicae.* Newark, New Jersey: Silver, Burdett & Co., 1928. Pp. x+70.

Modern German Stories. Edited with introduction, notes, and vocabulary by Allen W. Porterfield. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1928. Pp. xxxviii+410. $2.00.

PRIBBLE, EVALIN. *Correct English Usage:* A Study-and-Practice Book. Chicago: Lyons & Carnahan, 1928. Pp. 256.

ROBINSON, ANNA BELLE, and KING, FLORENCE M. *Learning Exercises in Food and Nutrition.* Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1928. Pp. viii+164. $1.20.

THURSBY, CLAIRE C., and KYNE, GRETCHEN DENKE. *Living Latin for the Junior High School,* Book One. New York: Macmillan Co., 1928. Pp. xxii+482.

TROWBRIDGE, CORNELIA R. *Constructive Spelling.* New York: Macmillan Co., 1928. Pp. xviii+142.

WOODBURN, JAMES A., and MORAN, THOMAS F. *Active Citizenship.* New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1928. Pp. xlii+342. $1.32.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES BUREAU OF EDUCATION AND OTHER MATERIAL IN PAMPHLET FORM

Annual Report of the General Education Board, 1926–1927. New York: General Education Board, 1928. Pp. x+52.

Five Years of the American Child Health Association. New York: American Child Health Association (370 Seventh Avenue), 1927. Pp. 76.

MARBERRY, J. O. *The Administration of Public Education in Centralized and Coördinated Schools.* University of Texas Bulletin No. 2810. Austin, Texas: University of Texas, 1928. Pp. 124. $0.50.

Recent issues of the Bureau of Education:

Bulletin No. 36, 1927—*Preparation of Teachers* by Wm. McKinley Robinson.

SMITH, HOMER J. *Teaching Aids for the Asking.* Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota, 1928. Pp. 60. $0.50.

MISCELLANEOUS PUBLICATIONS

COLEMAN, SATIS N. *Creative Music in the Home.* New York: Lewis E. Myers & Co., 1927. Pp. 400.

List of Educational Subject Headings. Prepared by L. Belle Voegelein for the Committee on the Classification of Educational Materials of the National Education Association Commission on Co-ordination of Research Agencies. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1928. Pp. xiv+338. $5.00.